University of Alberta

Mykola Kostomarov and Ukrainian Folklore

by

Sogu Hong ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

In

Ukrainian Folklore

Department of Modern Languages and Comparative Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Spring, 1998

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-28895-1

Canadä

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled Mykola Kostomarov and Ukrainian Folklore submitted by Sogu Hong in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

B Medwidsky

Dr. B. Medwidsky

Andriy Nahachewsky

Dr. A. Nahachewsky

John-Paul Himka

Dr. J. P. Himka

Dec. 19/97

Date of approval

To my parents

Abstract

Mykola Kostomarov (1817-1885) was the first critical folklorist who shifted the focus of Ukrainian folklore study away from the collection of "old documents or rare folksongs," which was encouraged by patriotic and nostalgic affection for a disappearing world, towards the search for a pure national foundation from the past on which to build the society of contemporary Ukraine. For Kostomarov, folklore study was a separate field of science; one whose goal was to uncover models from the past on which to shape the future. Furthermore, by emphasizing the relationship between folklore and history, he showed the other sciences that joint research with folklore was a possibility.

Also Kostomarov was a leading folklorist who attempted to connect folklore study with nationalist pursuits. In the 19th century, Ukrainian national consciousness developed through three stages. Stage one saw the creation of a national identity. Stage two held witness not only to the return of native vernacular but also a rise in its usage in literary and educational circles. Finally, the third stage held the beginnings of the desire for self-rule; as can be inferred from the growth of national-based organizations and the formulation of nation-oriented demands. Kostomarov played a great role

in all three stages of the development of Ukrainian national consciousness. Using folklore, Kostomarov established the elements of Ukrainian national identity and reconstructed the past of the Ukrainian people. Analyzing Ukrainian folklore and Slavic mythology, he noticed the democratic and federalist national character of Ukrainian people. Moreover, he organized the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius, the first Ukrainian ideological organization in modern times, and claimed that Ukraine would be the center of a democratic federation of Slavic nations.

Mykola Kostomarov's role in Ukrainian folklore is not always judged favorably. Some criticisms of his work include: that Kostomarov's study of symbolism was undistinguished and superficial, his comparison of Ukrainian folksongs with those of Russians was not really objective, his analogy between the character of a nation and that of an individual was somewhat simplistic, and finally, Kostomarov's ethnographic determinism downplayed sociological and economical factors.

However, only with his critical analysis and interpretation of Russian and Ukrainian folk materials did Ukrainian national characteristics begin to be regarded differently from those of Russia and did Ukrainians begin to be regarded as a historical nation, with a different nationality from that of Russians.

Table of Contents

Chapter I. Introduction 1

A. Statement of the problem 1

B. Purpose of the study and research questions 2

C. A review of related literature 3

D. Outline of the study 11

Chapter II. The motivation of Kostomarov's interest in folklore 15

A. Kostomarov's family background and childhood 15

B. Romanticism 18

C. The works and activities of writers, historians and folklorists of Kostomarov's days 23

Chapter III. Kostomarov's perspective on folklore 35

A. The significance of folklore 36

B. The relation of folklore with language, literature, and history 46

Chapter IV. Identification of the Ukrainian character 59

A. The religious (or spiritual) character 63

B. The historical character 70

C. The social character 76

D. The political character 79

Chapter V. Kostomarov's re-creation of Ukrainian history 82

- A. The pre-historic period 86
- B. The princely or pre-cossack period 91
- C. The cossack period 95
- D. The post-cossack or peasant period 102

Chapter VI. Kostomarov's legacy 105

Bibliography

- A. Collections of M. Kostomarov's works 111
- B. Individual works by M. Kostomarov 111
- C. Secondary sources 114

Chapter I. Introduction

A. Statement of the problem

There has been a certain trend in historical views concerning the Ukrainian nation, which proposes that Ukrainians are simply a part of the Russian nation. Russian and Ukrainian were merely two dialects of the same Russian language: the Great Russian speech of Muscovy.[1] This tendency in historical views still persists among individuals of other nations, including some Ukrainians, even after Ukraine has become an independent country. Based on this point of view, some people regard that the Ukrainians' clamor for national recognition was motivated merely by regionalism, while others pose the questions as to whether or not Ukraine has a history.[2]

One of main reasons that Ukraine is not regarded as a historical nation lies in the fact that Ukrainians have never had "the framework of a full-fledged nation state"[3] in their history. Therefore, Ukrainian history has had no real recognition and the existence of Ukraine as a separate nation has been denied by "mainstream" historians who "characterized Ukrainian history as "searching for roots," national advocacy or some other partisan pleading."[4] Moreover, Ukrainian history has been distorted by the Russian conception of history which regards Russia as the rightful successor of Kyivan Rus' and also includes Russians, Ukrainians, and Belarusians as ethnically identical. Ukrainians have been forced to integrate into the Russian political frame under the aegis of "brotherhood" and have been placed in an unequal position with the Russians. Therefore, in order to correct Russian bias in Ukrainian history and the relationship between Ukraine and Russia, it is necessary to re-examine the question of whether Ukraine is a historical nation and a different nation from Russia.

---

[1] Hugh Seton-Watson, "Russian Nationalism in Historical Perspective," in *The Last Empire: Nationality and the Soviet Future*, ed. Robert Conquest (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1986), pp. 15-16. Seton-Watson called this trend of historical view "the classical Russian view." According to this view, White Russians and Little Russians "simply formed part of the Russian nation whose home was now Muscovy." It is easy to find the classical Russian view in the historical record. For example, in July 1863, when Petr Valuev, the minister of internal affairs, banned publications in Ukrainian, he declared that the Ukrainian language "never existed, does not exist and shall never exist." See I. Krevetskii, "Ne bylo, net i byt' ne mozhet!," *Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk* 26 (1906), pp. 138-9, cited in Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), p. 282.

[2] "Discussion," in *Slavic Review* 54, no 3 (Fall 1995), pp. 658-723.

[3] Subtelny, *Ukraine*, p. xi.

B. Purpose of the study and research questions

This thesis presents a Ukrainian folklorist, Mykola Kostomarov (1817-1885), who dealt with and answered the aforementioned questions in the 19th century. M. Kostomarov was the first scholar to attempt to construct a synthesis of the Ukrainian national character on the basis of folklore, and to find the differences between the national characters of Ukrainians and Russians. As a folklorist and a historian, he sought the mysterious "soul" and unique national character of the Ukrainian people in folklore, and on that basis, he strove to reconstruct the history of the common Ukrainian people.

---

[4] Mark von Hagen, "Does Ukraine Have a History?," in *Slavic Review* 54, no 3 (Fall 1995), p. 658.

The focus of most studies on Kostomarov has centered on his role in Ukrainian history and politics, with respect to the Ukrainian national awakening. In this study, though I have also dealt with these issues, I have paid particular attention to his ideas on folklore in general and his special contributions to Ukrainian folklore. While examining these aspects, I have tried to explain why Kostomarov regarded folklore as an important material for his studies and how Kostomarov's study of folklore influenced the spread of Ukrainian national consciousness. Finally, through this study, I wanted to examine Kostomarov's idea on the question of Ukrainians as a historical nation.

In order to conduct this study, I posed several questions: what was the motivation of Kostomarov's interest in folklore? what was his perspective on folklore? and what was the purpose of his folklore study? Each of these questions is addressed in separate chapters, and several subsidiary questions concerning Ukrainian folklore are also examined: why was folklore so important to Ukrainian history? how was the study of folklore connected with other historical sciences? and how did the marriage of folklore research and national awakening occur? By examining all of these questions, I have tried to show how Kostomarov used folk materials to investigate the question of Ukraine as a historical nation.

C. A review of related literature

This study is based primarily on Kostomarov's writings pertaining to folklore, which are largely divided by their nature into three groups: 1) historical writings based on folk materials, 2) folksong collections, and 3) book reviews. I relied mainly on the sources of the first group, including such material as "Ob istoricheskom znachenii russkoi narodnoi poezii"[5] (On the historical significance of Russian popular poetry), (1843), "Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii k geografii i etnografii"[6] (On the relation of Russian history to geography and ethnography), (1863), and "Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhno-russkogo narodnogo pesennogo tvorchestva"[7] (The historical significance of the South Russian folksongs), (1872, 1880-83). In these three writings, Kostomarov clearly showed his basic ideas on folklore and reconstructed the Ukrainian history of the common people using folk materials.

Besides these works, Kostomarov left several folktale or folksong collections, such as "Kazka pro divku semylitku"[8] (A tale about a seven year old girl), (1860), "O tsikle vesennikh pesen v narodnoi iuzhnorusskoi poezii"[9] (On the cycle of spring songs in South Russian folksongs), (1843), and "Narodnye pesni, sobrannye v zapadnoi chasti Volynskoi Gubernii v 1844 godu"[10] (Folksongs collected in the western part of the province of Volhynia in 1844). These collections are helpful in understanding the characteristics of his early ethnographic works. The last publication includes 202 songs, some of which were composed on historical themes, collected by Kostomarov and his assistant, D. L. Mordovtsev.

---

[5] N. I. Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii russkoi narodnoi poezii," in *Sochineniia Nikolaia Kostomarova* (Kharkiv: Universitetskaia tipografiia, 1843), reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, ed. M. Hrushevs'kyi (Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1930), pp. 5-114. [I am using the latter publication in this thesis.]

[6] N. I. Kostomarov, "Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii k geografii i etnografii," in *Zapiski imperatorskogo russkogo geograficheskogo obshchestva* 12 (1863), pp. 92-113, reprinted in *Sobranie sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova*, book 1, vol. 3 (The Hague: Europe Printing, 1965), pp. 717-731. [Hague reprint used in this thesis.]

[7] N. I. Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhno-russkogo narodnogo pesennogo tvorchestva," in various numbers of *Beseda* (1872) and *Russkaia mysl'* (1880-1883). This work of over 600 pages was reprinted in *Sobranie sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova*, book 8, vol. 21, pp. 429-1081. [Hague reprint used in this thesis.]

[8] N. I. Kostomarov, *Kazka pro divku semylitku* (St. Peterburg: Drukarnia P. A. Kulisha, 1860). This short story was recorded by Kostomarov in the Ostrohozh *uyezd* (town) of the province of Voronezh in 1840. This was reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 115-117.

Kostomarov also wrote several book reviews, such as "Z privodu '*Zapisok o iuzhnoi Rusi*' P. Kulisha"[11] (On the occasion of the 'Notes on Southern Rus'' of P. Kulish), (1857), "Istoricheskaia poeziia i novye ee materialy: "*Istoricheskiia pesni malorusskogo naroda*," s obiasneniiami V. Antonovicha i M. Dragomanova. Tom pervyi"[12] (The historical poetry and its new materials: "Historical songs of the Little Russian people" with the explanations of V. Antonovych and M. Drahomanov. Vol. 1), (1874), and "Z privodu "*Malorusskikh narodnykh predanii i rasskazov*" M.

---

[9] N. I. Kostomarov, "O tsikle vesennikh pesen v narodnoi iuzhnorusskoi poezii," in *Maiak*, book 21, vol. 11 (1843), reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 118-126.

[10] N. I. Kostomarov, "Narodnye pesni, sobrannye v zapadnoi chasti Volynskoi Gubernii v 1844 godu," in *Malorusskii literaturnyi sbornik* (Saratov, 1859), pp. 179-353, reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 127-202.

[11] N. I. Kostomarov, "Z privodu '*Zapisok o iuzhnoi Rusi*' P. Kulisha," in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 241-281. This work first appeared in *Otechestvennye zapiski* in various numbers for 1857.

[12] N. I. Kostomarov, "Istoricheskaia poeziia i novye ee materialy: "*Istoricheskiia pesni malorusskogo naroda*," s obiasneniiami V. Antonovicha i M. Dragomanova. Tom pervyi," in *Vestnik Evropy*, no. 12 (1874), pp. 573-639, reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 299-334.

Dragomanova"[13] (On the occasion of the "Little Russian legends and folktales," by M. Drahomanov), (1877). These reviews furnished me with information concerning Kostomarov's opinion about the status of Ukrainian folklore studies in his day. In the first one, Kostomarov outlined the recent progress in Ukrainian ethnography and criticized the earlier folklorists, such as Izmail Sreznevs'kyi, who did not reveal the "secret sources" of his fantastic legends about the history of Zaporizhzhia. In the second, Kostomarov recognized Antonovych and Drahomanov's achievements in the realms of historical commentary and scholarly research methods. He placed high value on the fact that they gave a location and lineage for each of their songs. However, he disagreed with their periodization and discovered non-folk songs in their collection. In the third, Kostomarov emphasized the importance of folktales, fables, legends, and other works that have preserved the worldview and the spirit of the Ukrainian people.

In order to analyze the relationship between Kostomarov's folklore studies and his pursuits in national and political thought, I also examined his political writings and historical polemics, such as *Knyhy bytiia ukrains'koho narodu*[14] (Books of genesis of the Ukrainian people), (1846), "Dve russkiia narodnosti"[15] (Two Russian nationalities), (1861), "Mysli o federativnom nachale v drevnei Rusi"[16] (Thoughts on the federal principle in ancient Rus'), (1861), and so on. By examining these works, it became easier to understand Kostomarov's purpose of using folk material in his study. Besides the political and historical works, several writings concerning literature and language also partly contain Kostomarov's perception of folklore. Here belong "Obzor sochinenii pisannykh na malorossiiskom iazyke"[17] (A survey of the works written in the Little Russian language), (1844), "Malorusskaia literatura"[18] (Little Russian literature), (1871), "Malorusskoe slovo"[19] (Little Russian language), (1881), and so on. These works explain the status and goals of folkloristics in connection with other areas of study, such as literature and language.

---

[13] N. I. Kostomarov, "Z privodu "*Malorusskikh narodnykh predanii i rasskazov*" M. Dragomanova," in *Russkaia starina*, book 5 (1877), pp. 113-132, reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 335-352.

[14] Kostomarov wrote the Ukrainian text of *Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People* at the same time that he wrote the Russian text of it. This was discovered by the Ukrainian literary historian Pavlo Zaitsev and immediately published in the short-lived Ukrainian journal *Nashe mynule*, no. 1 (1918), pp. 7-35. For more information, see B. Yanivs'kyi, *Kostomarov's "Book of Genesis of the Ukrainian People" with a Commentary by B. Yanivs'kyi* (New York: Research program on the U.S.S.R., 1954). This book contains an English text of *Knyhy bytiia*, which I am using in this thesis.

The present study is partly biographical in nature because I have analyzed M. Kostomarov's life as a folklorist with an emphasis on his role in the Ukrainian national awakening. Therefore, I have examined

---

[15] N. I. Kostomarov, "Dve russkiia narodnosti," *Osnova*, no. 3 (1861), pp. 33-80, reprinted in *Sobranie sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova*, book 1, vol. 1, pp. 31-65.

[16] N. I. Kostomarov, "Mysli o federativnom nachale v drevnei Rusi," *Osnova*, no. 1 (1861), pp. 121-158, reprinted in *Sobranie sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova*, book 1, vol. 1, pp. 1-30.

[17] N. I. Kostomarov, "Obzor sochinenii pisannykh na malorossiiskom iazyke," *Molodik* 10 (1843), pp. 157-185, reprinted in M. I. Kostomarov, *Tvory* 2 (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1967), pp. 375-393.

[18] N. I. Kostomarov, "Malorusskaia literatura," in *Poeziia Slavian*, ed. N. V. Gerbel (St. Petersburg, 1871), reprinted in *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova*, ed. M. Hrushevs'kyi (Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1928), pp. 240-247.

[19] N. I. Kostomarov, "Malorusskoe slovo," in *Vestnik Evropy* 1, no. 1 (1881), pp. 401-407, reprinted in *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 267-270.

Kostomarov's autobiographical writing, which was recently reprinted.[20] I have found most of Kostomarov's aforementioned writings in various collections, *Sobranie sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova*[21] (Collected works of N. I. Kostomarov), (1967), *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova*[22] (Scientific-publicistic and polemical writings of Kostomarov), (1928) and *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*[23] (Ethnographic writings of Kostomarov), (1930), both edited by Hrushevs'kyi.

Additionally, I have obtained general information on Kostomarov's place in Ukrainian folklore from several secondary sources, such as the following: *M. Kostomarov iak fol'kloryst i etnohraf*[24] (M. Kostomarov as a folklorist and ethnographer), written by P. M. Popov; "N. I. Kostomarov, kak etnograf"[25] (N. I. Kostomarov as an ethnographer), written by V. Naumenko; "N. I. Kostomarov,"[26] written by Pypin; *Mykola Kostomarov: A*

---

[20] N. I. Kostomarov, "Avtobiografiia," in *N. I. Kostomarov: Avtobiografiia i Bunt Sten'ki Razina*, ed. Iu. A. Pinchuk (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1992), pp. 78-328.

[21] N. I. Kostomarov, *Sobranie sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova: Istoricheskiia monografii i izsledovaniia*, books 1-8, vols. 1-21 (The Hague: Europe Printing, 1967).

[22] M. I. Kostomarov, *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova*, ed. M. Hrushevs'kyi (Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1928).

[23] M. I. Kostomarov, *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, ed. M. Hrushevs'kyi (Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1930).

[24] P. M. Popov, *M. Kostomarov iak fol'kloryst i etnohraf* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1968).

[25] V. Naumenko, "N. I. Kostomarov, kak etnograf," *Kievskaia starina*, no. 5 (1885), pp. xxxv-xliv.

[26] A. N. Pypin, "N. I. Kostomarov," *Istoriia russkoi etnografii* 3 (St. Petersburg: M. M. Stasiulevich, 1891), pp. 151-187.

Biography,[27] written by Thomas M. Prymak; and "Mykola Kostomarov and East Slavic Ethnography in the Nineteenth Century,"[28] written by Thomas M. Prymak. They explain Kostomarov's life and activities as a folklorist and his role in the development of Ukrainian folklore studies. The fifth especially, "Mykola Kostomarov and East Slavic ethnography," has served as the starting-point for my thesis and as a guide throughout. While accepting the general information on Kostomarov from these works, I tried to differentiate my study from them in terms of research focus. I focused mainly on analyzing Kostomarov's standpoint on folklore and the ways in which he used folklore for nationalistic pursuits while others focused on explaining Kostomarov simply as a folklorist and on the significance of his works.

Since I pay special attention to the relationship between Ukrainian folklore and the national awakening of his time, it is necessary to define several terms such as "nation," "nationality," and "national identity." Moreover, an understanding of the relationship between folklore and nationalism (or nationalist pursuits) is also required. The term "nation" (*narod*) has no fewer than three meanings: 1) state[29]; 2) a group of people who feel themselves to be a community bound together by ties of history, culture, and common ancestry[30]; and 3) folk or peasantry.[31] In Kostomarov's writings, "nation" encompasses both the second and third meanings. For example, when Kostomarov mentions a Ukrainian nation, he is referring to the second meaning. However, when Kostomarov compares "*narod*" to an educated society, he does so with the third meaning in his mind.[32]

---

[27] Thomas M. Prymak, *Mykola Kostomarov: A Biography* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996).

[28] Thomas M. Prymak, "Mykola Kostomarov and East Slavic ethnography in the nineteenth century," in *Russian History* 18, no. 2 (Summer 1991), pp. 163-186.

[29] See Seton-Watson, "Russian Nationalism," p. 14. According to Seton-Watson, both terms 'nation' and 'state' "are frequently confused in the language of the media and in the rhetoric of world politics." Also see James G. Kellas, *The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), p. 3.

The term "nationality" (*narodnost'*), often used interchangeably with "nation" in English, also refer to a group of people who may have one or more of the following observable characteristics in common: a distinct territory, language, historical tradition, religion, and ethnographic features.[33] However, in Kostomarov's writings, the meaning of *narodnost'* is closer to "national character" or "national traits."[34]

For the definition of "national identity," which is defined in Chapter IV, the following sources proved to be very useful: *Questions of Identity: Czech and Slovak Ideas of Nationality and Personality*,[35] written by Robert B.

---

[30] Kellas, *The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, p. 2. According to Kellas, "Nations have 'objective' characteristics which may include a territory, a language, a religion, or common descent, and 'subjective' characteristics, essentially a people's awareness of its nationality and affection for it."

[31] See Frank J. Miller, *Folklore for Stalin* (New York and London: M. E. Sharpe, 1990), pp. ix-x. Miller identified three meanings of 'nation': 1) nation; 2) people; and 3) folk.

[32] See Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 432: "The power of education is so big that folk (*narod*) ... imitates the language of educated people ..."

[33] See Paul Robert Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine* (Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1996), pp. 352-353.

[34] See Marcus Wheeler and Boris Unbegaun, ed., *The Oxford Russian Dictionary* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 259.

[35] Robert B. Pynsent, *Questions of Identity: Czech and Slovak Ideas of Nationality and Personality* (Budapest, London, and New York: Central European University Press, 1994).

Pynset, and "Ethnic Identity Change among Soviet Nationalities: A Statistical Analysis,"[36] written by Brian D. Silver.

Besides the aforementioned sources, I also relied partly on the following materials: *National Character*,[37] written by Ernest Barker, "Nationalism and Bolshevism in the USSR,"[38] written by Alain Besancon in *The Last Empire*, and *Social Change and National Consciousness in Twentieth-Century Ukraine*,[39] written by Bohdan Krawchenko. Especially the last two were useful sources which helped me to understand the process of the formation of nation or nationality. *Folklore and Nationalism in Modern Finland*,[40] which was written by William A. Wilson in 1976, provided insight on the relationship between folklore and nationalist endeavors.

D. Outline of the study

This thesis consists of six chapters, including this introduction. The second chapter is devoted to exploring the factors that contributed to Kostomarov's interest in Ukrainian folklore. Three factors were examined: family background, romanticism, and the works and activities of writers, historians and folklorists of his day. Since Kostomarov was of half Russian and half Ukrainian origin, his family relationships and his childhood are examined. Furthermore, a dominant cultural current is usually inclined to influence the whole intellectual activity of a certain period. Therefore, I examined romanticism, the European cultural current of the time, and other scholars' activities which might have influenced Kostomarov. While examining these factors, I also look at the process through which Kostomarov became conscious of himself as a Ukrainian and the level or status of Ukrainian folklore study at the time.

---

[36] Brian D. Silver, "Ethnic Identity Change among Soviet Nationalities: A Statistical Analysis," (Ph. D. dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, 1972).

[37] Ernest Barker, *National Character and the Factors in Its Formation* (London: Methuen & Co., 1948).

[38] Alain Besancon, "Nationalism and Bolshevism in the USSR," in *Last Empire*, pp. 1-13.

[39] Bohdan Krawchenko, *Social Change and National Consciousness in Twentieth-Century Ukraine* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985).

[40] William A. Wilson, *Folklore and Nationalism in Modern Finland* (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1976).

In the third chapter I focus on Kostomarov's perspective on folklore. This chapter is subdivided into two parts. The first part, "The significance of folklore," deals with the reasons that Kostomarov regarded the problem of national character as connected with folklore. In this chapter I explain how he saw folksongs as genuine sources of national character. Here I introduce the classification of folksongs, which constitutes the theoretical framework of Kostomarov's folksong study. In the second part, I examine the relationship between folklore and other disciplines, including language, literature, and history. This part is devoted to revealing Kostomarov's perception that folklore is not a supplementary but rather a complementary study, and that folklore is a science which covers all aspects of socio-historical life.

In the fourth and fifth chapters, I examine the goals of Kostomarov's folklore studies, which were "the creation of Ukrainian identity" and "the re-creation of Ukrainian history." In the fourth chapter I explain how Kostomarov defined who Ukrainians were, by examining Ukrainian religious, historical, social, and political national characters on the basis of folk materials. In the fifth chapter, I examine Kostomarov's attempt to reconstruct Ukrainian history from the pre-historic period to the present time using folk materials. In this chapter, I also examine how Kostomarov's folklore studies shifted from the cultural to the political stage, and how Kostomarov connected folkloristics with nationalist pursuits.

In the sixth chapter, while re-examining all the questions posed in the introduction, I explain Kostomarov's contribution to Ukrainian folklore studies and introduce other scholars' appraisals of his work. Finally, I explain the direction to which Kostomarov pointed in his folklore study; reaching the conclusion that Kostomarov tried to prove that Ukraine was a historical nation, based on folklore - a lore which was regarded by Kostomarov as a dynamic force in the lives of the Ukrainian people.

It should be pointed out that in this thesis I use the following terms as synonyms: "*Malorossiia*" (Little Russia), "*Iuzhnaia Rus'*" (Southern Rus'), and "*Ukraina*" (Ukraine). Since in the nineteenth century, Little Russia was the official Russian term for Ukraine, Kostomarov had to use the term "Little Russia" together with "Southern Rus'." However, Kostomarov also used the term "Ukraine" to show his political idea that Ukraine had preserved its ancient Slavic virtues and would become an independent republic in a Slavic union in the future.

For the transliteration of the Russian and Ukrainian names and titles, I use the American Library of Congress system. By using this system, the names of those persons who were of Ukrainian origin and/or were identified most closely with Ukrainian culture are transcribed in their Ukrainian versions. As such, I prefer "Mykola Ivanovych Kostomarov," "M. Hohol'," and "I. Sreznevs'kyi" to their Russian forms of "Nikolai Ivanovich Kostomarov," "N. Gogol," and "I. Sreznevskii." However, in the Russian editions of their various published works, I leave these names and other words in their original Russian form. Ukrainian place-names are also presented in their Ukrainian forms. For example, “Kyiv” and “Kharkiv” are used instead of “Kiev” and “Kharkov.”

Chapter II. The motivation of Kostomarov's interest in folklore

Kostomarov's interest in Ukrainian folklore did not begin to surface until he entered the University of Kharkiv in 1833. In fact, until the late 1830s, Kostomarov did not even consider himself to be a Little Russian. Why was he not conscious of his identity as a Ukrainian? and what motivated his interest in Ukrainian folklore - something, which ultimately changed his perception of his own identity? The answer to the first question lies in his family background and childhood. The second can be explained by several elements, such as romanticism (the dominant European cultural trend of the time), and the works and activities of the writers, historians, and folklorists of his day.

A. Kostomarov's family background and childhood

Mykola Kostomarov was born in 1817, near the village of Iurasivka in the province of Voronezh, located in the north-east of the province of Kharkiv in the Russian Empire. The province of Voronezh, within Sloboda Ukraine[41] which had come under the control of the Muscovite tsar at the beginning of the sixteenth century and had been populated by freemen[42] and cossacks. Therefore, from that time onward in this area the population became a mixture of Great Russians and Little Russians. The nobility was predominantly Great Russian, while the majority of the total population consisted mainly of Ukrainian-speaking Little Russian serfs.

---

[41] Sloboda Ukraine was the old Ukrainian colonial territory which the cossacks began to cultivate in the 1630s. Although its inhabitants retained the cossack military system, they were never part of the *Het'man* state, but rather subjects of the Muscovite tsar from the very beginning. For more information, see Omeljan Pritsak, "Prolegomena to the National Awakening of the Ukrainians during the Nineteenth Century," *Culture and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Eastern Europe* (Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1985), pp. 100-101; and D. I. Bahalii, *Istoriia Slobids'koi Ukrainy* (Kharkiv: Osnova, 1990).

Ivan Petrovich, Mykola Kostomarov's father, was an educated Great Russian. His mother, on the other hand, had been born a Little Russian serf. Perhaps, due to the fact that she acquired an education in Moscow befitting the wife of a Russian country gentlemen, she apparently transmitted none of the Ukrainian language or traditions to her son.[43] Therefore, Mykola was brought up speaking Russian, even though he was surrounded by the rich Ukrainian folk culture of the province of Voronezh.[44]

Mykola grew up educated by his father, a member of the liberal-minded gentry and an admirer of the eighteenth century philosophers, a man in favor of the emancipation of the peasant. Ivan Petrovich, who was influenced by Rousseau's *Emile* and Voltairean rationalism, did not allow him to listen to fantastic folktales: "My father did not allow my imagination to go off into the fantastic and mysterious world. He did not allow others to tell me folktales and to amuse my imagination with yarns about ghosts; he was touchy that certain vulgar beliefs in wood demons, house spirits, witches, and so on, could possess me."[45]

---

[42] They were those people who had fled the historical Ukrainian lands to the west and came to resettle in Sloboda Ukraine.

[43] Anthony Mario Ivancevich, "The Ukrainian National Movement and Russification" (Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1976), p. 323.

[44] Prymak, *Mykola Kostomarov*, p. 18.

[45] Kostomarov, "Avtobiografiia," p. 82.

Ivan Petrovich liked Russian writers such as Zhukovskii and Pushkin very much and wanted Mykola to begin his formal education in Moscow. When he was ten years old, Mykola was brought to Moscow by his father and was enrolled in a boarding school. In childhood, Mykola Kostomarov was fully expected to receive a "modern" Russian education.

When he was eleven years old, Kostomarov had a crucial experience which was to change the course of his life - his father was beaten to death by peasants who had wanted to steal his fortune. According to Kostomarov, his father had not only had liberal and democratic ideas but also an ancestral haughtiness. Kostomarov said, "... that did not hinder him on occasion from displaying the whip to his social inferiors or from giving them a thrashing ... but after each such transgression he would ask for forgiveness from the offended party and try in some way to make up for his mistake and distribute money and gifts ..."[46] Therefore, Ivan Petrovich could be both severe and cruel as well as kind and generous to his peasants. It might have been that these inconsistencies brought misfortune to Ivan Petrovich.

After Kostomarov's father was murdered by his own servants, Kostomarov's mother attempted to hold on to the family estate. However, she succeeded only in part. Life for the family became a struggle. Kostomarov could no longer continue his education in Moscow, and his life was changed forever.

Was his father's murder connected with the nationalist sentiment of the Little Russians against the Great Russians? According to Ivancevich, violent protest was increasingly a characteristic feature of the final years of serfdom in southern Russia.[47] Yet, though Kostomarov was profoundly affected by the incident, it was not the primary cause of his interest in the cultural, historical and political issues between the Russians and Ukrainians.

---

[46] Kostomarov, "Avtobiografiia," p. 80, cited in Prymak, *Mykola Kostomarov*, p. 4.

Kostomarov began a new phase in his formal education in a small boarding school in Voronezh in 1828. The quality of education in such a small school was not as good as that of the expensive educational institutions in Moscow. He was taught by inadequate local teachers and surrounded by students who were not academically focused but interested only in hunting and soldiering. In 1831, Kostomarov went to the Voronezh gymnasium. There, according to his biography, Kostomarov took the following courses: Mathematics, Russian Literature, Natural History, World History, Greek, French and German.[48] However, the curriculum of the gymnasium did not contain anything which might have inspired his love for the Ukrainian language and folklore.

This leads us to the second important element that influenced Kostomarov, i. e., romanticism.

B. Romanticism

It was at the University of Kharkiv that Kostomarov became interested in all aspects of Ukrainian life, including its history, language, and most especially its folklore. When he entered the University of Kharkiv in 1833, many scholars and students were fascinated with romanticism and devoted themselves to the study of Ukrainian folklore and history. What was it that caused people, including Kostomarov, to become so infatuated with their culture? What was the powerful attraction of romanticism?

---

[47] Ivancevich, "Ukrainian National Movement," p. 324. Concerning the situation before and after the emancipation of the serfs, Subtelny says that on the Left Bank and in southern Ukraine, there were relatively few disturbances, compared to the Right Bank, where memories of the *haidamak* uprisings were very strong. However, at that time, minor clashes were widespread, and that peasants resumed their struggle. See Subtelny, *Ukraine*, pp. 252-257.
[48] Kostomarov, "Avtobiografiia," pp. 85-88.

Romanticism was a movement in literature, art, and music: a world view which arose toward the end of the 18th century in Germany, England, and France. In the beginning of the 19th century it spread to Eastern Europe; to regions, such as Russia, Poland, and Ukraine. This philosophical current appeared as a reaction to the rationalism of the Enlightenment. As such, romanticism emphasized the innate goodness of the individual, the cult of feeling as opposed to that of reason, an enthusiasm for folk poetry and folksongs, a search for historical consciousness, and an intensified learning of history.[49]

Romanticism reached Ukraine and Russia via the newly-established western style imperial universities. The University of Kharkiv, especially, became the center of romanticism in Ukraine. With the opening of this university in 1803, first-rate scholars were invited from Germany and France to Kharkiv, and they brought German romanticism with them.[50] German romanticism, which was initiated by Johann Gottfried von Herder (1774-1803), was represented by J. L. Carl Grimm (1785-1863), W. Carl Grimm (1786-1859), Clemens Brentano (1778-1842), Ludwig Achim von Arnim (1781-1831), and others, and exerted a profound influence in strengthening ethnographic interest in much of Eastern Europe, including Ukraine.

---

[49] B. Kravtsiv and D. H. Struk, "Romanticism," in *Encyclopedia of Ukraine* 4 (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1988), pp. 402-403.
[50] Pritsak, "Prolegomena," p. 103.

Among the many elements of romanticism, the value of folklore and the notion of nationality - the main concepts of Herder's idea - were especially emphasized by the Eastern European thinkers, such as some Czechs, Slovaks, and Ukrainians.[51] Herder's notion of the importance of folklore in the development of literature encouraged a surge of interest in folklore and history. The study of both resulted in a general reawakening of the Slavic peoples, including the Ukrainians.

There was a socio-political reason for the popularity of Herder's idea in Central and Eastern Europe. In the late eighteen century the people of Central and Eastern Europe were faced with different situations than those of Western Europe and the United States of America. In Western European countries, such as France and England, the state and nation had already grown together over a long period without any conscious effort to create a nation. Also in the United States the independent state came into being first, and was followed by a conscious effort on the part of the state to mold its inhabitants into a nation.[52] However, in Central and Eastern Europe, national boundaries seldom coincided with those of existing states. Therefore, in many cases, one nation was often ruled by members of other nations. German romanticism, which was proclaimed by Herder as a tool to unify Germany - an area, ~~which~~ was divided into 1800 different territories with an equal number of rulers - became the most popular idea among

---

[51] For the information of Herder's influence on Czech and Slovak culture, see Pynsent, "Herder's picture of the Slavs and its impact on Safarik and Kollar," in *Questions of Identity*, pp. 73-86.

[52] Seton-Watson, "Russian Nationalism," p. 15.

Eastern and Central European nations. It played a great role in spreading national consciousness among the nations and in establishing nation states in the nineteenth century.

Herder's perspective consists of three basic concepts relevant to this study: continuity in history, an independent cultural entity, and folk songs as the imprint of the soul of a nation. First of all, Herder believed that all things rely one upon the other and each has thus grown out of the other. From this point of view, he said that the fatherland "has descended from our fathers"[53] and emphasized the concept of continuity in history. Second, Herder believed that each nation is organically different from every other nation. This is because each nation formed an independent cultural type which was determined by the physical environment in which that nation was located. For him, no two nations can have the same character, because no two nations have shared common environments and histories.[54] Therefore, he said, "every nation contains the potential of its own happiness within itself."[55] Finally, Herder emphasized that the national soul of a people expresses itself best in that people's folk poetry. Folk poetry is the archive of a nationality and the imprint of the soul of a nation.[56]

Among these three basic elements of Herder's idea, the third concept - that of folk poetry - was especially emphasized because he felt that only folk poetry bridges the chasm between the present and the past, and rediscovers the lost soul of a nation. “For Herder the true medium of thought is feeling, which he compared to the sense of touch and which - as an act of knowledge - he believed possible only through the medium of native language.”[57] Therefore, “only through the medium of one’s native language could one think naturally and respond to and express one’s national soul.”[58] For Herder, folk poetry is the source of each nation’s language and the mirror of its ancient people’s soul.

---

[53] J. Herder, *Sämtliche Werke* 5, ed. Bernhard Suphan (Berlin, 1877-1913): reprinted in 1967-1968, p. 565, cited in William A. Wilson, "Herder, Folklore and Romantic Nationalism," in *Journal of Popular Culture*, no. 4 (1973), p. 821.

[54] Wilson, "Herder," p. 822.

[55] Herder, *Sämtliche Werke* 5, p. 509, cited in Wilson, "Herder," p. 821.

[56] Wilson, "Herder," pp. 825-826.

> a nation ... has nothing more valuable than the language of its fathers. In it lives its entire spiritual treasury of tradition, history, religion, and principles of life, all its heart and soul. To deprive such a nation of its language, or to demean it, is to deprive it of its sole immortal possession transmitted from parents to children.[59]

In later years, Herder’s idea of each nation’s own language and folklore played a great role in the creation of a new Germany and was assessed by T. Benfey. Benfey said, “The recognition of the great value of the German folk song wakened an interest in the other creations and expressions of the German folk soul ... From this ... there arose not only an entirely new conception of the history of civilization, but above all a reverence and love for our people, such as had long been lost in Germany.” Finally he mentioned, “the whole people became engrossed in the idea of marshaling all its powers to regain the independence so nearly lost and to make secure its nationality by means of the re-establishment of its unity."[60]

---

[57] Pritsak, “Prolegomena,” p. 103.
[58] Wilson, “Herder,” p. 827.
[59] Herder, *Sämtliche Werke* 17, p. 58, cited in Wilson, “Herder,” p. 827.

Ukrainians, who did not have their own country, responded to Herder's call to action with great enthusiasm. The fact that Ukrainians had a highly developed folk poetry, rather than a vernacular literature, is another reason that romanticism became so popular in Ukraine. Herder himself was so impressed by the beauty of Ukrainian culture and territory that he predicted: "Ukraine will become another Greece: the beautiful sky, the gay spirit of the people, their musical gifts, and their fertile land will arise one day."[61] It comes as no surprise, therefore, that Herder's ideas became popular in Kharkiv, and that Kostomarov was influenced by them so deeply. In his work on the historical significance of Russian popular poetry, Kostomarov praised Herder considerably: "Herder dealt a decisive blow to the old ways of thinking and firmly placed the flag of nationality [*narodnost'*] upon an unshakable foundation."[62]

C. The works and activities of writers, historians and folklorists of Kostomarov's days

In the 1830s, the idea of collecting and studying folk songs and poetry, motivated by romanticism, was soon taken up by Ukrainian and non-

---

[60] T. Benfey, *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft und Orientalischen Philologie in Deutschland* (Munich, 1869), p. 318, cited in Wilson, "Herder," p. 830.

[61] J. Herder, "Journal meiner Reise im Jahre 1769," in Herder, *Sämtliche Werke* 4, p. 402, cited in Subtelny, *Ukraine*, p. 228.

[62] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 5, cited in Popov, *M. Kostomarov iak fol'kloryst*, p. 21.

Ukrainian intellectuals, such as M. Tsertelev, M. Maksymovych, I. I. Sreznevs'kyi, P. A. Lukashevych, O. Bodians'kyi, and so on. Parallel to the growing interest in Ukrainian folklore, many Ukrainian poets and authors had already begun to use the Ukrainian language even prior to the 1830s. They used the Ukrainian land, history, and customs as their literary subjects. Among them were I. P. Kotliarevs'kyi, H. F. Kvitka-Osnov'ianenko, and I. P. Hrebinka.

Mykola Kostomarov was influenced by the works and activities of the above mentioned Ukrainian intellectuals, and began to participate in this intellectual movement. Here I intend to introduce several intellectuals who were especially influential on Kostomarov, based on Kostomarov's biography.

His first exposure to Ukrainian literature was through some of H. F. Kvitka-Osnov'ianenko's novels (1778-1843). In his biography, Kostomarov said that "Until that time I did not read one Little Russian book, except for Kotliarevs'kyi's *Eneida* ... Now equipped with a new point of view, I got the stories of Kvitka, which were published at that time under the pen-name Hryts'ko Osnov'ianenko."[63] At that time Kostomarov's proficiency in Ukrainian was not good enough to understand Kvitka's novels. From that moment, Kostomarov enthusiastically studied the Ukrainian language with the help of his servant and other Ukrainians.

---

[63] Kostomarov, "Avtobiografiia," p. 102. Kvitka's first Ukrainian short story and the first story in modern Ukrainian literature is "Saldats'kyi partret: Latyns'ka pobrekhen'ka po nashomu rozkazana" (A soldier's portrait: a Latin tale told in our tongue), (1833). See I. Koshelivets', "Kvitka-Osnov'ianenko, Hryhorii," in *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, p. 729.

> I was very annoyed with the fact that there was no dictionary. In the absence of a dictionary, my servant assisted me. He was a native of our Sloboda. His name was Foma Holubchenko and he was a young boy of about sixteen years of age. Besides this, wherever I met informally with Little Russians who were close to me, without formality, I besieged them with questions: what does such a word mean or what does such a turn of speech mean.[64]

Later Kostomarov became acquainted with Kvitka and often visited him. According to his biography, Kostomarov was impressed not only by Kvitka but also by his old brother and wife, who were very proud of the Ukrainian culture: "I very much got to like this old man (Kvitka's brother), who very heartily loved his own nationality; in the same way his wife made a good impression on me; she is not a native Little Russian. However, she spoke only with great love about all that is Little Russian."[65]

Kvitka-Osnov'ianenko used the Ukrainian language in his works not only to bring his mode of expression closer to his subject of Ukrainian life, but also to prove that it could be a literary language. Kvitka believed that a literary language should correspond to the everyday spoken language of those who use it. Almost all his works dealt with Ukrainian subjects and characters. However, according to Ivancevich, Kvitka did not extend his nationalism beyond the linguistic and literary level.

> He strove to evoke a love for the Ukrainian land and people through

---

[64] Kostomarov, "Avtoviografiia," p. 102.
[65] Kostomarov, "Avtoviografiia," p. 110.

> his readers' emotions. While he criticized the abuses in Russian society, and especially the behavior of Great Russian government officials, and defended the status of Little Russian as a distinct literary language, he did not carry his nationalism into the field of politics. He did not portray Great Russians as foreigners and his works contained not a hint of separatism.[66]

Besides Kvitka's novels, Mykola Hohol's short stories about Ukrainian history also influenced Kostomarov's thinking. *Vechera na khutore bliz Dikan'ki*[67] (Evenings on a Homestead Near Dikanka), (1831-32), and *Taras Bulba*,[68] (1835), were such stories in which Ukrainian folksongs and traditions made a deep impression on him. Images of cossack fighting portrayed as struggles against Polish power and Roman Catholicism in *Taras Bulba* and other works later influenced Kostomarov's own work, *Pereiaslavska nich*[69] (The night at Pereiaslav), (1841). In this play, the Orthodox people fight for their religious freedom against their enemies, the Poles, Uniates, and Jews. Some of the incidents seem to be reminiscent of

---

[66] Ivancevich, "Ukrainian National Movement," p. 164.

[67] This consists of eight tales. They appeared in various magazines, and the first four were published in book form in 1831, when Hohol' was twenty-two, the others a year later. See N. Gogol, *The Collected Works of Nikolay Gogol: Evenings on a Farm Near Dikanka*, Trans. Constance Garnett (New York: Vail-Ballou Press, 1926), p. v.

[68] "Taras Bulba" first appeared in *Mirgorod* (1835) which also included other tales, such as "The old-world landowner" and "The story of the quarrel between Ivan Ivanovich and Ivan Nikiforovich." See N. Gogol, *Taras Bulba and Other Tales* (London and New York: Everyman's Library, 1966), p. xv.

[69] This appeared first in print under the pseudonym Iieremiia Halka in *Snip* (1841), pp. 7-91, reprinted in *Pereiaslavska nich. Trahediia Iieremii Halky* (L'viv, 1867) and in M. I. Kostomarov, *Tvory* 1 (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1967), pp. 203-268.

Hohol's *Taras Bulba*, in which the targets of cossack hatred are not strictly Great Russianism but Polonism and Catholicism. [70]

His acquaintanceship with the historian M. M. Lunin at the University of Kharkiv helped to broaden Kostomarov's interest in history. Kostomarov said, "Generally, this professor's lectures made a great impression on me and caused a decisive turning in my spiritual life; I came to love history more than any other thing and from that moment I enthusiastically committed myself to the reading and learning of historical books."[71] Kostomarov became fascinated with history, especially the history of the common people: "The poor peasant, toiler of the land, seems as if not to exist for history. Why does history not tell us anything about his every-day life, his spiritual life, his feelings, and the way his joys and sorrows are expressed? I soon arrived at the conclusion that history must be studied not only from dead chronicles and records but also from the living people."[72]

Having developed a populist historical view, Kostomarov realized the importance of folklore and discovered the necessity of researching folklore: "It is impossible that the past lifetimes would not be reflected in the life and recollections of the descendants. It is only necessary to search and one would certainly find a lot which till now was neglected by scholars."[73] From that moment, for Kostomarov, folklore and history were inseparable. This idea was also one of the main elements of romanticism, as emphasized by Herder.

---

[70] Ivancevich, "Ukrainian National Movement," p. 329.
[71] Kostomarov, "Avtobiografiia," p. 96.
[72] Kostomarov, "Avtobiografiia," p. 96.
[73] Kostomarov, "Avtobiografiia," p. 96.

However, until then, Kostomarov was not yet conscious of his identity as a Ukrainian. He first felt himself a Ukrainian after he became acquainted with the folksong collections, compiled by Mykhailo Maksymovych, Osyp Bodians'kyi, and Izmail Sreznevs'kyi. These folklorists and historians were impressed by Herder's writings and traveled the countryside to discover, collect, and eventually to publish these pearls of folk wisdom and creativity.

Maksymovych's collection of Ukrainian folk songs *Malorossiiskie pesni*, was the first to appear in print.[74] It made a great impression on Mykola Kostomarov and helped him to find his identity as a Ukrainian: "For the first time in my life I obtained Maksymovych's Little Russian song collections of 1827... The Little Russian songs captured all my feeling and imagination to the point, that within a month I already knew by heart the collection of Maksymovych, and then began to study his second collection, and got acquainted with historical songs (*dumy*), and became even more enthused about the poetry of this nation."[75] How deep an impression Maksymovych's collection made on Kostomarov may be judged from the following comment by Panteleimon Kulish in his reminiscences about Kostomarov:

> Nikolasha [Kostomarov], like all of us, students of the Russian schools, at first scorned everything Ukrainian and did his thinking in the language of Pushkin. Yet to both of us, in two different points in Little Russia, this unusual event happened. In Kharkiv he came accross the 1827 collection of Ukrainian songs by Maksymovych and I, in Novgorod Siverskij, also by accident came into possession of

---

[74] M. A. Maksimovich, *Malorossiiskie pesni* (Moscow, 1827).
[75] Kostomarov, "Avtobiografiia," p. 101.

> the Ukrainian *dumy* and songs of the same Maksymovych, published in 1834. In one day both of us changed from Russian into Little Russian populists.[76]

This was how Kostomarov and Kulish began to consider themselves Ukrainians. What changed Kostomarov's perception of his own identity? Of course, it was an emotional factor, the beauty of the Ukrainian folksongs. In the preface to his collection, Maksymovych explains the importance of Ukrainian folklore and the notion of nationality, which might have helped Kostomarov to develop his understanding of the relationship between Ukrainian folklore and nationality.

Maksymovych said that in general folksongs are the best sources for learning about a nationality (*narodnost'*). He continued this thought by stating that the beauty of folksongs "may serve as evidence that poetry is an inborn quality of the human spirit and that true poetry is its own creation."[77] This is similar to Herder's idea on folk poetry: "Poetry is the expression of the weaknesses and perfections of a nationality, a mirror of its sentiments, the expression of the highest to which it aspired."[78] Furthermore, Maksymovych emphasized the importance of folk songs and prose to the development of national identity.

---

[76] V. Shenrok, "P. A. Kulish," *Kievskaia starina*, series 1, vol. 72 (1901), pp. 169-170, cited in George S. N. Luckyj, *Between Gogol' and Ševčenko* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1971), pp. 32-33.

[77] M. Maksimovich, "Predislovie," *Malorossiiskie pesni*, pp. ii-iii, cited in Luckyj, *Between Gogol'*, p. 31.

[78] Herder, *Sämtliche Werke* 18, p. 137, cited in Wilson, "Herder," p. 825.

> It seems that the time has come when the worth of nationality is recognized; a desire to develop a truly Russian poetry is appearing. Our better poets have already ceased to use foreign works as bases and patterns for their works and are now striving toward the development of unique poetry, based on a native foundation, which has long been drowned out by foreign transplants and has rarely emerged through them.
>
> In such a situation, the monuments which might more fully express our nationality deserve greater attention: these are songs where the soul sounds out, moving emotions, and tales where the national fantasy shines out.[79]

Finally, Maksymovych compared Russian and Ukrainian songs, and bolstered Ukrainian pride in their own nationality. In the preface to *Malorossiiskie pesni,* he said that Russian songs express a spirit reconciled to its fate and readily submissive to its dictates. On the contrary, Ukrainian songs express the struggle between the spirit and fate. Little Russian songs are characterized equally by fits of passion, compact firmness, strength of feeling and by natural expressiveness. On the other hand, Russian songs are marked by a lack of expression of the substance of real life, forgetfulness, dejection, and inactiveness.[80] Therefore, for Maksymovych, Ukrainian songs had more aesthetic value than Russian songs. All these comparisons by Maksymovych were related to the question of Ukrainian cultural independence.

---

[79] M. A. Maksimovich, *Sobranie sochinenii* 2 (Kyiv: P. A. Frits', 1877), pp. 450-451, cited in Ivancevich, "Ukrainian National Movement," pp.150-151.

[80] Ivancevich, "Ukrainian National Movement," pp.150-151.

By the 1830s another prominent Ukrainian folklorist and historian, Osyp Bodians'kyi influenced Kostomarov. Following Maksymovych, Bodians'kyi was anxious to point out the differences between Russian and Ukrainian songs. Bodians'kyi agreed with Maksymovych that the Russian songs were marked with great despondency and showed submission to one's fate. On the other hand, the Ukrainian songs were quite unique and dramatic.

> the folk poetry of South Russes (Ukrainians, Little Russians) is with all its content and form diametrically opposite to the poetry of the Northern Russes. It could not be otherwise. Of all the Slavic races, the north and south Russes are most unlike each other, notwithstanding their common name which incidentally is foreign to both of them if one considers their origin ... How different is the North from the South and how different are the peoples who live there! ... The dissonance in the characteristics of the Russes and their poetry arises from their origins, the areas which they inhabit and the difference of their cultural and historical lives and other circumstances.[81]

Bodians'kyi was a great believer that there was sufficient originality and vitality in the Ukrainian historical monuments and folksongs to justify not only a separate division from Russia in the past but to provide nourishment for a new distinctive Ukrainian culture and literature.[82] Thus, even prior to the 1840s Bodians'kyi went further than other Ukrainian ethnographers or folklorists claiming Ukrainian national autonomy. He pointed out the considerable differences between northern and southern Russians developed by centuries of differing historical circumstances.

---

[81] I. Bodians'kyj, *O narodnoi poezii slavianskikh plemen* (Moscow, 1837), pp. 122-24, cited in Luckyj, *Between Gogol'*, pp. 33-34.
[82] Luckyj, *Between Gogol'*, p. 35.

Another folklorist who also provoked Kostomarov's interest in Ukrainian folksongs and history was I. I. Sreznevs'kyi. Sreznevs'kyi's collection on the history of the Zaporizhzhian cossaks, entitled *Zaporozhskaia starina* (Zaporizhzhian Antiquity), especially motivated Kostomarov to collect and record Ukrainian folk songs and customs himself. At the time Sreznevs'kyi, who was a Russian, was influenced by Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling's philosophy, which provided a link between popular expression and the concept of the nation. According to Schelling's philosophy of aesthetics, the common spoken language is the basis of the creative spirit and intellectual achievement of a people.[83] This sentiment is almost identical to Herder's.

Influenced by Schelling's philosophy, Sreznevs'kyi began collecting popular songs and poems, regarding them as great works of art and expression, a folklorist research method which Kostomarov would later follow. Later Kostomarov commented on Sreznevs'kyi's influence on himself: "This acquaintanceship [with Sreznevs'kyi] made a strong influence on me for a long time."[84]

---

[83] Ivancevich, "Ukrainian National Movement," p. 147. For more information, see Dmitry Čiževsky, "The Influence of the Philosophy of Schelling (1775-1854) in the Ukraine," *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* 5, no. 2, 3 (winter-spring 1956), pp. 1128-1139.

[84] Kostomarov, "Avtobiografiia," p. 105.

Like other folklorists, Sreznevs'kyi also dealt with the problem of Ukrainian nationality and noted the differences between the Ukrainians and the Russians:

> At the present time it is obvious that the Ukrainian language (or as some prefer to call it the Little Russian language) is a language and not a dialect of the Russian or Polish languages, since some have proven and many are convinced that it is one of the richest Slavic languages ... that it is a poetical, musical, and picturesque language.[85]

Being influenced by the works and activities of contemporary folklorists, Kostomarov began to collect folk materials in Ukrainian, especially historical songs. In his biography, Kostomarov explains how he was drawn to the Ukrainian language and folklore, and how he began to undertake ethnographical trips.

> I was struck and carried away by the genuine charm of Little Russian folk poetry and I never suspected that such refinement, such depth and freshness of feeling were in the works of a people so near to me, and about whom, as I realized, I knew nothing .... Within a short time I had read everything that was printed in Little Russian, but this did not seem enough for me; I wanted to become more closely acquainted with the people themselves, not from books but from their living speech, from a live contact with them. With this purpose I began to undertake ethnographical trips from Kharkiv to the

---

[85] A. N. Pypin, "I. Sreznevsky," *Istoriia russkoi etnografii* 3 (St. Peterburg, 1891), p. 94, cited in Ivancevich, "Ukrainian National Movement," p. 152.

> neighboring villages, the inns which at that time were genuine folk clubs. I listened to their conversations and discussions, noted down words and phrases, entered into conversations, questioned people about their everyday lives, wrote down news conveyed to me, and forced myself to sing songs.[86]

In the early 19th century, as I already explained above, national awareness began to develop in Ukraine from the knowledge and appreciation of local customs and traditions as well as from the new academic interest and analytic methods for such folklore materials. Mykola Kostomarov was strongly influenced by this new wave of local patriotism, appreciation for local folklore, and an effort to understand and use the Ukrainian language.

In the late 1830s and the early 1840s, many Ukrainian folklorists had already begun to realize the differences between the Ukrainian and the Russian language, culture and history. However, the folklorists' work of that generation did not contain any political claim for the Ukrainian people. This development occurred later, with folklorists such as Mykola Kostomarov.

---

[86] Kostomarov, "Avtobiografiia," pp. 101-102.

Chapter III. Kostomarov's perspective on folklore

While accepting Herder's ideas as well as those of the earlier Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian folklorists, Kostomarov gradually formed his own views on folklore. This formation of his viewpoint on folklore began to evidence itself when he wrote his second dissertation, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii russkoi narodnoi poezii."[87] It is also worth noting that in this dissertation, Kostomarov began to distinguish the Ukrainian nationality from that of the Russian.

Kostomarov continued to polish his basic opinion on the significance of folklore and presented his basic assumptions about folklore and historical methodology in his article "Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii k geografii i etnografii." In this article, Kostomarov claimed that folklore should take its place among the historical sciences, and explained his perception of the relationship between history and folklore as well as the task of folklorists and historians.

During the 1870s and 1880s, Kostomarov continued to open up new fields of research for folklorists or ethnographers,[88] and published what is regarded as his most extensive and important work - "Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhnorusskogo narodnogo pesennogo tvorchestva." In this work, Kostomarov detailed Ukrainian history from prehistory to Cossackdom, using only Ukrainian folklore sources and citing texts of original songs. In the preface to this work, Kostomarov classified folklore into categories and discussed the characteristics of folksongs and the relationship of folklore with other sciences (such as language, literature, and history).

---

[87] Kostomarov was supposed to defend his first Master's thesis "O znachenii unii v zapadnoi rossii" (The significance of the union in western Russia), in 1841. However, through the opposition of the local clergy, his thesis was rejected and even destroyed. Then he had to write a second dissertation on a different topic. See James T. Flynn, "The Affair of Kostomarov's Dissertation: A Case Study of Official Nationalism in Practice," in *Slavonic and East European Review*, no. 52 (1974), pp. 188-196.

[88] Kostomarov was one of the first to publish a number of scholarly works on various aspects of Ukrainian folklore. Therefore, many folklorists and historians were influenced by Kostomarov's critical study of folklore. Especially after the 1870s, such scholars, as P. P Chubyns'kyi, V. B. Antonovych and M. Drahomanov

Based on the above mentioned works, in this chapter, I examine Kostomarov's point of view on folklore.

A. The significance of folklore

The term 'folklore' was not defined exactly by Kostomarov and was often replaced by the term 'ethnography.' The two terms were used interchangeably at the time. However, it is not difficult to deduce his perception of folklore by examining his writings. In "Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii k geografii i etnografii," Kostomarov mentions that ethnography deals with "the representation of a people's life,"[89] in which the viewpoints of the people on their own lives is expressed. He also said, "Without this aspect, the study of history is just like describing the upper branches of a tree, but not dealing with the stem or the roots."[90] Therefore, for Kostomarov, folklore or ethnography was the essential source of history as

---

asked Kostomarov to edit or review their collections. For more information, see Popov, *M. Kostomarov iak fol'kloryst*, pp. 63-81.

[89] Kostomarov, "Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii," p. 719.

[90] Kostomarov, "Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii," p. 720.

it contains the spirit of the people. In the following section, I intend to examine the reason that Kostomarov considered folklore so important.

1. National character and folklore

Kostomarov understood national character as a particular culture and a particular culturally patterned behavior. According to Kostomarov, the character of a nation (*narod*), in its formation and its manifestation, is analogous with the character of an individual man. In "Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhno-russkogo narodnogo pesennogo tvorchestva," Kostomarov said, "Each nation has something characteristic about it which is more or less reflected in each individual who belongs to it. This is the national character which enables us to view the entire mass as a single person."[91]

Kostomarov emphasized the unconscious-instinctive processes of the formation of a national character: "Every individual person has his own character: This character is comprehended by his actions and movements, especially in those cases when it reveals itself unconsciously, trying not to be noticed, tested, and known."[92] In this way, Kostomarov tried to assess national character as a psychological investigation as well as the analysis of the collective products of people, such as activities, rituals or folklore.

Kostomarov continued to say that each nation, imagined as one person, has its own ideal and wants to attain it in order to achieve better living conditions in the future. According to him, this is a general quality not only of an individual but also of a people. Kostomarov understood that a nation receives its character from the minds and the wills of its members in the same way that an individual's character is made up from the operation of his mind and his will.

---

[91] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 7.
[92] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 7.

Next Kostomarov raised an important question about the source from which national character flows. For Kostomarov, literature was a source: "literature belongs to such a source ... the idea that all literature is the expression of a society is completely true."[93] Kostomarov divided literature into two types: class [written] literature and folk [oral] literature. Of these two categories, folk literature is the genuine source of national character.

> Let's assume that there are no original creations in [written] literature, but only imitations, only that which is foreign, - this means that a society which expresses itself through its literature does not feel its own nationality, but instead that which is foreign. But, always, however faded, pretended, and dry the literature were to be, and however little it represented for national character, - [written] literature will be an expression only of that certain class of the nation, maybe of its smallest part - whereas all of the rest have their own, genuine, fresh [oral] literature.[94]

In "Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhno-russkogo narodnogo pesennogo tvorchestva," Kostomarov divided folk literature into six categories: 1) tales (*skazaniia*), stories (*skazki*), and legends (*legendy*), 2) riddles (*zagadki*), 3) sayings (*pogovorki*) and proverbs (*poslovytsy*), 4) spells (*zagovory*) and incantations (*zaklynaniia*), 5) legends or traditions (*predaniia*), and 6) songs

---

[93] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 7.
[94] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 7.

(*pesni*). Each category reflects the people's inner qualities which make up the national character. For example, the first category is the expression of people's fantasy while its ingenuity is reflected in the second. The third category contains the wit of people and the fourth and the fifth show their beliefs and memories. Finally, the sixth category - songs - expresses the people's feelings, embracing parts of all of the previous categories.

Among these different aspects of folk literature, Kostomarov regarded folksongs as the most important source of national character: "the folksong takes first place among all creative works."[95] What led him to reach this conclusion? This will be discussed in the next section.

2. The genuine source of national character: folksongs

Kostomarov's emphasis on folksongs is connected to the nature of folksongs. Closeness to life, truth and feeling are all abundant in folksongs. According to Kostomarov, folksongs are so close to life that they are always sung and reflect feelings and ideas: "A person of the common people expresses by means of a song what he has in his mind at the present moment; he begins a song because it suits what he feels, and he always feels that which is stirred up by phenomena of [his] real life."[96] Kostomarov also said, "true poetry does not allow lies and hypocrisy."[97] Therefore, "moments of poetry are moments of creation; a people experiences them and leaves monuments behind."[98] For Kostomarov, folksongs are true because they contain the unlearned and innate feelings of people. Nothing reveals a people's soul better than folksongs.

---

[95] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 7.
[96] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 430.
[97] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 7.
[98] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 7.

Kostomarov believed that songs are important because legends and other folk literature are not strong enough expressions of a people's heart and can not convey a people's true feelings. Also the latter are sometimes too much representations of local customs and beliefs to be able to express the feeling of the entirety of a nation.[99] Therefore, songs are irreplaceable.

While Kostomarov emphasized the significance of folksongs, he also mentioned the weaknesses of folksongs as a source of national character. He said, "Songs are important, but they are never the exclusive sources of our knowledge, of a people's concepts, views, beliefs, recollections: for this, other monuments of folk literature are essential and often more important than songs."[100] Also he said that songs are not enough of a source in order to understand the material life of a people.

Kostomarov agreed with Herder and Giambattista Vico that folk poetry reflects the socio-cultural pattern of the society in which it originates.[101] He paid great attention to discovering the socio-cultural pattern in Ukraine, reflected in folksongs. Kostomarov analyzed folksongs from a cultural, historical and social perspective. In terms of history he established the periodization of historical songs: 1) Prehistoric 2) Princely or Pre-cossack 3) Cossack and 4) Post-cossack or Peasant periods. He identified four representative social classes in the socio-cultural life of Ukrainians and believed that these reflected the course of Ukrainian history. In the next section, we will examine how and why Kostomarov classified folksongs.

---

[99] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 433.

[100] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 433.

[101] Wilson, "Herder," p. 825. Also, see Isaiah Berlin, *Vico and Herder* (London: Hogarth Press, 1976), p. xvii: According to the author, Vico believed that "there is a pervasive pattern which characterizes all the activities of any given society: a common style reflected in the thought, the arts, the social institutions, the language, the ways of life and action, of an entire society."

3. The classification of folksongs

In order to use folksongs as a source of national character, Kostomarov needed to assess the value of the various kinds of folksongs and classify folksongs into several groups for the specific uses. According to Kostomarov in "Ob istoricheskom znachenii russkoi narodnoi poezii," folksongs should be regarded as four different kinds of sources. First, folksongs are regarded as chronicles of events or sources for "external" history. According to him, external history is that which a historian uses to explain the events of the past. He included tsars' courts, rulers' accessions, legislation, wars, and diplomatic relations into external history.[102] Kostomarov believed that only historical songs belong to the sources for external history. However, even their value is limited due to the fact that the poetic fantasy of these songs often conceal historical realities.

Second, folksongs are regarded as the representation of the way of life of a people, or sources for "internal" history,[103] through which historians would be able to judge the social structure, family life, manners, customs, and so on of a people. Though the value of these songs is greater for internal history than for external history, these songs demand supplementation and critical analysis because they are often rife with inconsistencies, fragmentary exposition and unclarity of content.

---

[102] Kostomarov divided history into two parts: external and internal history. See "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 8, and "Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii," pp. 719-721.

[103] According to Kostomarov, the complete understanding of the life in the past can not be obtained unless a historian includes knowledge of internal history, which is expressed through household items, clothes, foods, way of life of a

Third, folksongs can also serve as the subject of philological study. In this aspect, these folksongs also have a great value. The significance of folksongs is quite specific and relates to the history of language development.

Fourth, folksongs can be regarded as a monument to a people's opinion and views of themselves and their surroundings. Kostomarov believed that this is the most important and indisputable value of folksongs. This value of folksongs, he said, made it possible to discover national character: "Life in all its forms flows out from the internal self-perception of human beings. On this is based what we call character: a special view of things, which both individuals and entire peoples possess."[104]

Kostomarov classified folksongs into several groups according to the aspect of human life they represent: religious, historical, and social. Since folksongs reflect these three aspects of life, they can be divided into three parts: ritual songs, epic (or historical) songs, and songs of life-style (or social songs).[105] According to Kostomarov, ritual songs are good sources for discovering the people's point of view on the natural surroundings or

---

people, their economy, and so on. See "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 8, and "Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii," p. 721.

[104] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 8.

[105] In "Ob istoricheskom znachenii russkoi narodnoi poezii," (1843), Kostomarov divided songs into spiritual (*dukhovnaia*), historical (*istoricheskaia*), and social (*obshchestvennaia*) songs. Twenty years later in "Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhnorusskogo narodnogo pesennogo tvorchestva," (1872), Kostomarov used different terms for the classification of songs: ritual (*obriadnye*), epic (*bylevye*), and songs about life-style (*bytovye*).

spirituality. Epic songs reveal a people's standpoint on their past political life while social songs show people's general view on both their present lives as well as on those of the past.

Ritual songs, according to Kostomarov, are further divisible into two groups. The first group is connected with the seasonal events of the agricultural year while the second is connected with family life. The first group consists of spring songs (*vesnianki*), summer songs (*troitskiia*[106], *petrivochnyia*[107], and *kupal'skiia*[108] *pesni*), working songs (*grebetskiia*, *zazhnivnyia*, and *obzhinochnyia pesni*),[109] Christmas songs (*koliadki*), and new year songs (*shchedrivki*). The second group contains wedding songs (*svadebnye pesni*), lullabies (*kolybel'nye pesni*), and funeral songs (*pogrebal'nye pesni*) or laments (*prichitanie*).

Epic songs are also sub-divided into two groups: a) songs based on historical events, and b) *dumy*. According to Kostomarov, both are similar to each other in their themes and content, but differ in form. The first group involves songs which have a rhythmically arranged regular strophe and contain other musical elements. In contrast, *dumy* can not exactly be called songs. Kostomarov placed *dumy* between prose and song, though, he said, they lean closer to the song.

---

[106] Songs of Trinity or Whitsuntide (*Zeleni Sviata* or "the Green Festival," which is the first in the series of summer holidays and marked by the decoration of houses, rooms, windows, and icons with green branches and leaves.) See Z. Kuzela, "The Summer Cycle," in *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia* 1 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963), p. 329; and Oleksa Voropai, "Zeleni sviata," in *Zvychai nashoho narodu* (Kyiv: Oberih, 1993), pp. 388-407.

[107] Songs of St. Peter's day (June 29, O.S., July 12, N.S.). St. Peter is regarded as the guardian of the fields, the harvest, and bee-keeping. See *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia* 1, p. 329; and Voropai, "Sviato Petra i Pavla," in *Zvychai*, pp. 429-430.

[108] Songs of the Kupalo festival, which is related to the Rusalii and is basically an agricultural festival celebrating the beginning of harvesting and the summer solstice. See *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia* 1, p. 330; and Voropai, "Sviato Ivana Kupala," in *Zvychai*, pp. 409-428.

[109] Songs of reapers and harvesters.

> Those narratives are called *dumy* that are expressed by even rhythmical speech arranged in such a manner that one is repeated several times in a row. The number of syllables between rhythms is uneven. One should not call the *duma* prose either: when a *duma* is sung, it becomes clear that it is not prose, and the division of speech into verses is formed by the intonation in the singing.[110]

Even though the *dumy* are not songs, Kostomarov said, they are still performed in recitative to a musical accompaniment on the *bandura* or *kobza*. The singers, called *bandurysty* or *kobzari*, can give a variety of expression through an increase or decrease in volume of voice and changes in the speed of singing. Also *dumy* have variants like other songs. Furthermore, Kostomarov added one more important indication to identify the *dumy* as songs: "*dumy* are imbued with feeling and their main purpose is to stimulate feeling. This feature is more striking in the *dumy* than in songs, in which sometimes feelings hide under the characteristic symbolic expression of folk poetry."[111]

Social songs are those songs which depict the daily and general phenomena of social life. To this group belong several *dumy* which are not based on historical themes but rather draw a moral from everyday life. The farewell of a cossack with his loving wife or with his family, and the death of cossacks, are the most frequent themes of *dumy* in this group. Besides them, Kostomarov also included several occupational songs (those dealing with the mode of living and with the interests of different social and professional groups) into the social song group. *Chumak* (salt carter) songs are the most outstanding among them. Also the songs of *burlaky* or *syroty* (landless peasants or orphans) belong to this group. Except for these songs, Kostomarov said that this group of social songs still embraces many themes, such as the general condition of peasant life, the rights of serfs, love, sadness, and so on.

---

[110] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 435.
[111] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 436.

Judgments on Kostomarov's classification of folksongs may vary. On the one hand, his classification of folksongs is not expansive enough to cover all the different kinds of folksongs. Especially, lyrical poetry - such as ballads, humorous songs, dance songs, and others - is not specifically classified. However, on the other hand, this classification provided him with the possibility of diachronic and synchronic studies of folksongs. After establishing the periodization of historical songs, he tried to understand how folksongs have developed and changed over time as a result of their own internal dynamics and external influences. Also he tried to see the social, cultural, and political matters that folksongs reflect in a society at a particular point in time. Furthermore, this classification of folksongs made it possible for him to think that folk is not a synonym for peasant, nor is it limited to one stratum of society. In other words, through his classification of folksongs, Kostomarov could see broad social classes and stratums, and bring them into diachronic and synchronic frames for his study.

B. The relationship of folklore with language, literature, and history

1. Language and Folklore

As long as folklore is considered an important source of national character language will always remain an essential issue in folklore. Common feelings and common thoughts imply a common and single language in which they can be expressed and by which they can be communicated. In many of his works, Kostomarov claimed that people's thoughts and feelings are best expressed in their own native language: "Many Little Russians felt that it was impossible to express in Russian that which can be expressed in Little Russian, therefore, people began to use their own language."[112]

Accepting earlier folklorists' opinion on the difference between Ukrainians and Russians, Kostomarov insisted that Ukrainian language was not Russian: "The language usually called Little Russian, which is spoken in the southwestern provinces of Russia and in the Galician kingdom, is not a recently developed dialect of the Russian language."[113] He continued to assert that both languages had developed separately over the centuries. According to Kostomarov, both had evolved from Church Slavonic, but they developed in separate directions when Rus' split into western and eastern sections.

---

[112] Kostomarov, "Obzor sochinenii pisannykh," p. 378. Also see Kostomarov, "Malorusskoe Slovo," pp. 267-271. In this article, Kostomarov said, "many people ... find it more easy and comfortable for themselves to write in the Little Russian speech (*narechie*), than in the Russian language ... because people set themselves the task of depicting the past and present life of Little Russians with their own language and philosophy ..." See p. 282.

[113] Kostomarov, "Obzor sochinenii pisannykh," p. 375.

While Kostomarov claimed that Ukrainian is not a dialect of Great Russian, he still regarded Ukrainian as a general Slavic idiom: "it (Little Russian) has existed for a long time and exists today as a dialect (*narechie*) of the Slavic root, occupying a middle place, in its grammatical-lexical structure, between the eastern and western idioms of the huge Slavic tribe, a correct, rich, and harmonious idiom and one which is capable of literary development."[114] According to Ivancevich, at that time the term *narechie*, which is used to signify "dialect", could also be used to signify "language" or any other spoken idiom.[115]

In "Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhno-russkogo narodnogo pesennogo tvorchestva," Kostomarov divided Little Russian (or Southern Russian) into three dialects: Ukrainian (*ukrainskoe*),[116] Polissia-Northern (*polessko-severskoe*),[117] and Red-Russian (*chervono-russkoe*) or Rusin (*rusinskoe*).[118] According to Kostomarov, in spite of the several differences in phonetics and grammar of these three dialects, speakers understood each other and did not regard themselves as different people. Therefore, any works written in Ukrainian in Russian territory could be also enjoyed in Galicia. However, as Kostomarov understood, unique local songs and variants existed in each dialect because of their differences.

---

[114] Kostomarov, "Obzor sochinenii pisannykh," p. 375.

[115] Ivancevich, "Ukrainian National Movement," p. 340.

[116] Kostomarov used the term "Ukrainian" for Little Russian popular speech. However, he did not attempt to use this term to emphasize the distinction between Little Russia and Great Russia.

[117] According to Kostomarov, this dialect is different from Ukrainian in terms of several phonetic features. For example, there is no voice alteration in soft 'i'. Also in the middle of words, "ui" or "u" sound appears. See Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 434.

[118] See Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 434.

> In Red-Rus', besides the majority of songs, which are common in all southern Russian territories, there is a stock of their own local songs, which as far as we know are not found in any other territories: thus some koliadky which are remarkable in their antiquity, and kolomyiky - aphoristic short songs, historic songs about events which occured in Galicia. In both Galicia and western Ukraine there are songs which are composed in half Polish tone and which to some extent have popularity. Similarly in the places where south Russian nationality comes into contact with north Russian nationality, songs arise exhibiting a more or less strong influence of the north Russian element.[119]

In this regard, Kostomarov considered folksongs an important source of philological study. In fact, in his opinion, the study of variant and local peculiarities of folksongs is essential to the study of the history of the language. Therefore, for Kostomarov, another reason for studying Ukrainian folksongs was to reveal the distinct features and the developmental process of Ukrainian. However, the study of the relationship between language and folklore was even more important for Kostomarov because folklore texts and folksongs reveal a people's soul and thoughts only when they are expressed in their native language.

2. Literature and Folklore

The literature embodied in the language of any nation is one of the molds of its life, and one of the influences which shapes its development. In this regard, Kostomarov emphasized the value of literature as a source of national character. According to Kostomarov, written literature and oral literature shared a very close relationship and influenced each other. For example, on the one hand, the former adopted the framework and motifs of the latter, on the other hand, the latter continued to imitate the way of expression of the former. However, for Kostomarov, definite differences still existed between them in the following aspects: authenticity or origin, means of transmission, and variations. He explained these differences in "Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhno-russkogo narodnogo pesennogo tvorchestva," by comparing Ukrainian folksongs to Western European folksongs.

---

[119] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 435.

For Kostomarov, folksongs were only those songs that are transmitted orally without a fixed type and never with a single author. On the contrary, popular songs, which are of literary origin, were created by well-known individuals. According to him, in Western Europe, collectors and researchers of folklore also included those songs, which were created by a single author into their collections. Therefore, he said, "their folksongs are those that are sung by the people, but our folksong are those that are created by the people."[120] Kostomarov referred to folksongs as original works, and popular songs as imitative and translated works. Even if the latter greatly influences the development of an educated society, he said, "One should not recognize in them such meaning as we can recognize in the original works."[121]

---

[120] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 429.
[121] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 429.

Kostomarov admitted the great influence of literacy on human life. He wrote that literacy completely changed the way and means of expression of poetical work. For example, if a literary person expresses his inspiration in written language, it appears in a complete form and becomes his own spiritual property. "Even if other literate people love this work and begin to repeat it, they then realize that the work which has an effect on their spirit, does not belong to them."[122] The written work is the property of the author and not of the entire mass. As such it does not reflect the soul and feelings of the whole people, but rather only the ideas and thoughts of the author.

According to Kostomarov, the transmission of folk literature is purely oral, and hence the idea of a fixed form was alien. During the oral transmission of a folksong, alteration and addition to the song take place under the influence of the poetic mood of another person. Thus the content and form of the song become more complete and larger, passing from one place to another.

> Poetic flashes, appearing at the beginning with two or three characteristics in the form of an image, comparison, outline, short narrative or recollection - are transmitted from mouth to mouth and are altered and elaborated under the influence of the poetic mood of other people; the thing expressed by a person is so closely taken to heart by another person that the latter does not recognize that it is not his own creation and therefore he is not at all ashamed to add something, in conformity with impressions, produced by the phenomena of the environment surrounding him, or the feelings of his own heart; thus, the seeds of a song, by being added to, expand

---

[122] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 431.

> and at the same time run into the seeds of other songs, combine with them, and overlap with each other: one moves from here to there, another - from there to here, and in such a way larger songs are formed themselves, having the semblance of an entirety of content and completeness.[123]

Here, Kostomarov found important differences between literary works and folk works. The characteristics of folklore - communal character, oral transmission, and limitless variation - distinguish folk literature from written literature which is literary in origin, written in a fixed form and belongs to an individual.

While Kostomarov mentioned the differences between written literature and folk (oral) literature, he also agreed to the idea that folklore is an integral part of written literature, not an intrusive element in it. It is something which may affect the language, structure and themes of outstanding works in both poetry and prose. Kostomarov tried to prove this opinion by explaining Shevchenko's role in Ukrainian literature in "Malorusskaia literatura." He said, "Up to the appearance of Shevchenko, Little Russian literature confined itself to the representation of people's life in the form of stories and tales, partly in the form of drama, or to poems in the tone of people."[124] He continued to say, "Shevchenko's poetry does not deviate from the forms and devices of Little Russian folk poetry: they are deeply Little Russian; at the same time their meaning is never local: they always introduce the interest of common people."[125]

---

[123] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 430

[124] Kostomarov, "Malorusskaia literatura," p. 243.

[125] Kostomarov, "Malorusskaia literatura," p. 244.

Influenced by contemporary Ukrainian writers, such as Hohol', Shevchenko, Kvitka, and others, Kostomarov himself began to write poetry and prose in Ukrainian, using the form, style, and motifs of Ukrainian folklore. Kostomarov published his first Ukrainian poetry book - *Ukrains'kii balady*[126] (Ukrainian ballads) - in 1839. One year later another collection of ballads was published under the title *Vitka*[127] (Branch). Several poems from these collections mourned the disappearance of the cossacks, which was a popular theme of Ukrainian folksongs. According to Ie. Shabliovs'kyi, "the poet [Kostomarov] readily adapts folk tales, superstitions, and legends. He often utilizes folk ballads ("The brother and the sister," "The maple, the popular, and the birch," "Mr. Shul'pika") as the basis of his own works, uses the imagery and symbols of folksongs, applies folk style, and turns to rhythmical forms close to folk laments."[128]

Besides poetry, he also wrote the tragic play, *Sava Chalyi*[129] (1838), which portrayed a power struggle between cossack elders during a struggle with the Poles in the seventeenth century. According to Shabliovs'kyi, "the theme of the well-known historical song, in which betrayal is condemned, forms the basis of this work."[130] In 1841, Kostomarov published another tragedy, *Pereiaslavska nich*.

---

[126] This was Kostomarov's second book, published under the pseudonym Iieremiia Halka. This was a small collection of poetry based on historical Ukrainian songs and some translations. Iieremiia Halka, *Ukrains'kii balady* (Kharkiv, 1839), reprinted in Kostomarov, *Tvory* 1, pp. 37-52.

[127] Iieremiia Halka, *Vitka* (Kharkiv, 1840), reprinted in Kostomarov, *Tvory* 1, pp. 53-83.

[128] Ie. Shabliovs'kyi, "Mykola Ivanovych Kostomarov, ioho zhyttia ta diial'nist'," in Kostomarov, *Tvory* 1, p. 11.

[129] Kostomarov's first book, his historical drama *Sava Chalyi*, appeared in print under the pseudonym Iieremiia Halka. See Iieremiia Halka, *Sava Chalyi: Dramaticheskiia stseny na iuzhno-ruskom iazyke* (Kharkiv, 1838), reprinted in Kostomarov, *Tvory* 1, pp. 145-202.

For Kostomarov, written literature is also as important as folk literature because written literature and language may give something to the national mind - or more specifically, it can unify the minds of the members of the national group. In "Malorusskaia literatura," Kostomarov says, "Little Russian common people practically did not understand it (the written or book language). When talking to the common people, an educated Little Russian of the upper class had to lower himself to the common people's language, otherwise, they would not have been able to understand each other."[131] Therefore, in Kostomarov's opinion, through the diffusion of education, the more the literary tradition of a nation becomes common in the minds of its members, the more is that nation united, and the more homogeneous is its life. Kostomarov emphasized the necessity of spreading education in Ukrainian among the masses.

> Little Russian literature is a more recent phenomenon, mainly because it has an exclusive folk character ... earlier it was considered indisputable that written language must be distinguished from oral language, and a writer, taking up the pen, prepared himself for such speech as he himself would not use in simple conversation.[132]

> In Little Russia are schools and Little Russians are educated in Russian; it is necessary to solve the problem unbiasedly and exactly:

---

[130] Shabliovs'kyi, "Mykola Ivanovych Kostomarov," p. 12.
[131] Kostomarov, "Malorusskaia literatura," p. 240.
[132] Kostomarov, "Malorusskaia literatura," p. 240.

> how widely has education in the mass population advanced? and is it easy to attain? The resolution of this question will also provide the answer for the following: Were the Little Russians who want to use their native speech as a tool to ease the spreading of education among the mass population right? or were they wrong?[133]

Judging from the above analysis, it can be said that, for Kostomarov, both folklore and literature must have an influence on each other and develop together. On the one hand, folklore should influence the general direction of literature so that it would reflect the way of life of the people and their worldview in the written language. On the other hand, literature has to raise the level of folk culture. Kostomarov believed that this mutual relationship would contribute to national unity.

3. History and Folklore

Until the beginning of the nineteenth century, the status of folklore as a component of the study of history was not widely recognized. History and folklore were not necessarily considered as complementary studies. Historians denied the validity of folklore as evidence of history, and folklorists ignored the historical content in folklore. However, in Ukraine, while collecting and studying folklore for their artistic and historical value, several folklorists began to recognize the value of folklore as an historical science and use folklore for historical materials.

Kostomarov first tried to use folklore in writing the history of the common people in his second dissertation "Ob istoricheskom znachenii russkoi narodnoi poezii." After this dissertation, he continued to consider history and folklore as complementary studies and to write many historical works based on folk materials. Why did he continue to consider folklore an essential part of historical materials? and what was his conclusion as to the relationship between history and folklore?

---

[133] Kostomarov, "Malorusskaia literatura," p. 247.

For Kostomarov, the purpose of history is "to present an account of the movement of a people's life"[134] because he placed common people at the center of historical studies. Therefore, the subject of history has to be "the means and the ways of the development of the power of a people's activities in all spheres in which the living process of human groups appears."[135]

Then he raised another question: What material is the most valuable to historical studies? During his early days in Kharkiv, Kostomarov had already realized that the historical records preserved from the past were incomplete. Documents preserved in public or private archives related only to such events that needed or commanded a written record, or to those which interested ruling classes or the educated society. It was the detail of every-day thought and action that was missing. For Kostomarov, history needed to be filled by all that can be learned about the thought, ideas, beliefs, conceptions, and aspirations of common people. The source for this kind of information was folklore.

Kostomarov believed that folklore was the only means of discovering the earliest stages of the social and cultural history of modern man. In this regard, Kostomarov emphasized the significance of archeological folk materials: "The purpose of archeology is to learn the past of a people's life and of objects, and the purpose of history is to learn the life of a people and of the people themselves."[136] Another branch of traditional folk materials was related to customs, beliefs, and rites. It also rested upon a solid basis of historical origin or fact.[137] Finally, Kostomarov considered folk literature, especially folksongs, to be the most important folk materials for discovering the people's standpoint on their own lives.

---

[134] Kostomarov, "Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii," p. 719.
[135] Kostomarov, "Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii," p. 719.

For Kostomarov, the main purpose of using folksongs for historical writing was not to find historical fact but to understand the viewpoint of the common people on their own history. Kostomarov said, "these songs are generally more important for history in the representation of the way of life of the past and in the expression of the viewpoint of people than in the relationship with factual truth."[138]

However, Kostomarov still believed that people's memories in folksongs contained significant information about the past that written materials did not have: "First of all, let us say that ... people's memory does not always correspond to written history. Many things, deemed glorious by historians, remain unknown to the people. Furthermore, many things, which the people glorify, are difficult to find in the written historical materials."[139]

Kostomarov believed that folk materials would become useful only when folklore establishes a place among the historical sciences. Because folklore is a "study about the people," the subject of folklore has to be "the people themselves, not the external manifestations of their life."[140] In fact, until the 19th century, folklore was still a young discipline without satisfactory scientific credentials. Kostomarov criticized the earlier folklorists who restricted their works in noting and describing the tradition and customs of a people, and called for a consideration of folk materials as a product of past forces in that nation.

---

[136] Kostomarov, "Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii," p. 721.

[137] See Kostomarov, "O tsikle vesennikh pesen," pp. 118-126. Through the study of ritual spring songs, such as *haivky* and *vesnianky*, Kostomarov partly introduced the customs and rites of the spring season and also explained the historical origin of the name of these rituals.

[138] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 731.

[139] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 694

> Ethnography devotes itself to representing the life of a people, which has reached a certain stage of historical development, having a definite moment of the present time as a point of departure. Therefore, the importance of relationships between these two branches (history and ethnography) of human knowledge partly forms itself naturally. In order to comprehend and present the course of the past life of the people, it is necessary to understand and clearly to imagine this people in the last stage of its development, and on the contrary - the ethnographic expression of the existing image of a people can not have meaning if we do not know what brought it to this form, and what grouped the signs, which composed the essence of this form, and why it took shape in such a way, and not in another.[141]

Thus, in Kostomarov's opinion, the historian and the folklorist have to be brought face to face with their own mandates in order to work alongside each other, and use each others' materials and conclusions appropriately. Kostomarov said that both ethnographers and historians often make the same error: “they considered the material for their subject as if it were the subject itself.”[142] Finally, he concluded that “an ethnographer should be a contemporary historian like a historian deals in his works with the ethnography of the past.”[143]

---

[140] Kostomarov, "Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii," p. 721.
[141] Kostomarov, "Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii," p. 719.

---

[142] Kostomarov, “Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii,” p. 721.
[143] Kostomarov, “Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii,” p. 722.

Chapter IV. Identification of the Ukrainian Character

In the 19th century, Ukrainian national consciousness developed through three stages. The first stage was the creation of a national identity. The second was the "rebirth" of native vernacular and its increasing use in the literary and educational activities. The third, and final stage, was the growth of national-based organizations and the formulation of nation-oriented demands that implied the desire for self-rule.[144] Kostomarov played a great role in all three stages of the development of Ukrainian national consciousness. However, using folk materials, Kostomarov played a special role in the creation of national identity and the re-creation of Ukrainian history. In this chapter, I intend to examine how Kostomarov created Ukrainian identity in order to develop Ukrainian national consciousness.

The term 'identity' is related not only to the question of who a person is, but also to the qualities, beliefs, and ideas which make an individual feel that he or she is different from everyone else or that he or she belongs to a particular group.[145] To define a personal or group identity is to define who a person is or to which group he belongs. While Kostomarov became more and more conscious of his identity as a Ukrainian, he also began to become curious of the group identity: Who are Little Russians? In his writings, Kostomarov did not mention nor use the term "identity." However, if we examine the direction he pursued in his folklore study, it can be said that the purpose of his study on folklore was to find the answer of who Ukrainians were.

---

[144] Subtelny, *Ukraine*, pp. 221-222.

[145] For more information on scholarly works on identity and on various definitions of identity, see Alan Dundes, "Defining Identity through Folklore," *Folklore Matters* (Knoxville: University of Tennessess Press, pp. 3-7; Also See Silver, "Ethnic Identity Change," pp. 12- 17; and Pynset, *Questions of Identity*, p.vii.

"National identity," also known as "ethnic identity," has been studied by social scientists in a variety of ways. According to Robert B. Pynset, individuals or groups become particularly familiar with the problems of identity when they find themselves left outside what is considered to be the norm or "bearers of culture" in their society.[146] Also according to Bohdan Krawchenko, "national identity is not a natural condition of humanity, but an alignment in society that occurs when elites consciously choose to elect ethnic symbols as the basis for mobilization in competition with other elites for control over a local society."[147] Both authors suggest that the formation of national identity is basically a political, rather than a cultural phenomenon. It is initiated by the cultural and political activities of the intellectuals of a society, not by natural condition.

During the first half of the nineteenth century, present-day Ukraine was governed by two major European Empires, the Habsburg and the Russian. Russian ruled lands were furthermore divided into several geographic territories - the Left Bank, the Right Bank and the Steppe. Since Ukraine did not exist as a political entity at that time, the answer to the question of Ukrainian identity - "what is Ukraine?" and "who are Ukrainians?" - was not self-evident. It became visible only after the rise of intellectuals who: firstly regarded local speech, customs, and traditions as key integrating factors in the creation of national identity, and secondly developed the concept of nationhood or nationality. Kostomarov was the first of those leading intellectuals who consciously chose ethnic symbols for creating a Ukrainian national identity. Also, Kostomarov was one of the first who regarded folklore as the best source from which to draw the symbols and the character of a nation.

---

[146] Pynset, *Questions of Identity*, p. vii.
[147] Krawchenko, *Social Change and National Consciousness*, p. xviii.

Kostomarov paid great attention to finding certain characteristics and core symbols of Ukrainians in their folklore. For him, it was the nature or content of group characters or symbols that marked the Ukrainian group as "national." Kostomarov also thought that folklore was clearly one of the most important vehicles for the communication of a people's symbols. The following paragraph shows Kostomarov's perception of national symbols.

> National symbols, arranged in a system, make up the symbolism of a nation, which serves us as an important source for understanding its spiritual life. In a general sense, the symbolism of nature is the extension of natural religion; a creator is revealed in creation; the person's heart loves the omnipresent spirit in the phenomena of the physical world. Therefore, such a love for nature is identical with love for the creator; and because the spirit, revealing its ideas in nature, … [and] places the same ideas as the basis of the moral and spiritual nature of man, then the love of nature is identical with love of a human being … it is better to say that the relationship between a person and nature takes the middle ground between the relationship of the creator to the person himself, between divine love and human love … All this is revealed in the symbolics, which have extraordinary importance for ethnography and history.[148]

---

[148] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 15.

Using national characters and symbols, Kostomarov gradually formed his concept of Ukrainian identity in his three major writings. First, in his second dissertation, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii russkoi narodnoi poezii," he selected Ukrainian characteristics and symbols from folksongs and compared them to those of Russia. Then he differentiated the Ukrainian nationality from the Russian one: "In spite of the mistaken views of some ethnographers, the Russian nationality has always been divided into two halves: the Southern and the Northern Russian, or as they are usually called: the Little Russian and the Great Russian."[149] At this stage, Kostomarov's attempt to identify a unique Ukrainian identity was mainly encouraged by local patriotism or a nostalgic affection for a disappearing world. Therefore, his definition of the Ukrainian nation was not quite complete or clear. However, the conclusion from his second dissertation furnished him with an increasingly strong foundation needed for defining Ukrainian national identity.

It was in his political writing *Knyhy bytiia ukrains'koho narodu* that Kostomarov began with increasing sophistication to systematically and clearly differentiate Ukrainian identity from that of Russia and Poland. In 1846, when Kostomarov organized the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius[150] (the first political organization of the Ukrainian national movement with a definite program), Kostomarov began to link his folklore study with nationalistic pursuits. Finally, in 1861, when he wrote what has been called the "gospel of Ukrainian separatism,"[151] "Dve russkiia narodnosti," Kostomarov clearly defined the concept of a Ukrainian nationality and strengthened his earlier conviction that the Ukrainian nationality was different from the Russian one.

---

[149] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 8.

[150] The Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius was founded in 1843 by leading Ukrainian intellectuals, such as the historian Mykola Kostomarov, the poet and artist Taras Shevchenko, the poet, historian, and publicist Panteleimon Kulish, the young and learned jurist Mykola Hulak, Vasyl' Bilozers'kyi, and others. This short-lived political organization strove for the union of the Slavic peoples into a single free federated republic with Kyiv as its capital. However, in April 1847 the Brotherhood was liquidated following the disclosure of its existence to the administration, and some ten of its leading members were tried, exiled and

Based on the works of Kostomarov mentioned above, I intend to discuss how Kostomarov defined Ukrainian national identity, by examining Ukrainian religious (or spiritual), historical, social, and political national characteristics.

A. The religious (or spiritual) character

1. Religiosity

In his work "Ob istoricheskom znachenii russkoi narodnoi poezii," Kostomarov stated that "religiosity is one of the most important conditions (elements) of national character,"[152] and tried to present many examples which proved that Ukrainians were religious. According to Kostomarov, the religious character of Ukrainians is evident mainly in two sources: folksongs dedicated to religious subjects and those poetic works in which

---

forbidden to write. See B. Yanivsk'kyi, "Commentary by B. Yanivs'kyi," in *Kostomarov's "Book of Genesis of the Ukrainian People,"* p. 1.

[151] Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, "Ukrains'ka istoriografiia i Mykola Kostomarov," *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk*, book 5, vol. 50 (May, 1910), p. 223. Also, Dmytro Doroshenko used this expression in "A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography," in *The Annals of Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Science in the U. S.* 5-6, no. 4 (1957), p. 139.

[152] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 9.

religious concepts and feelings are manifested. This second category includes epic genres (legends), lyric genres (poems), and moral *dumy*.

Kostomarov found that the events occurring in the life of Jesus Christ and saints were popular in Ukrainian legends. According to him, sacred events such as the birth of Jesus Christ take first place among these subjects. He continued that biblical themes, including the birth of Christ, also occupy a special place in many *koliadky* which have been influenced by folk legends and apocryphal works. The Mother of God is a popular theme of religious songs. "The Holy Virgin is represented as a defender of unfortunate people and a savior of sinners."[153]

According to Kostomarov, legends concerning the life of the Apostles and the saints provide people with moral examples. Religious hymns and lyrical songs show the inclination of Ukrainians to contemplation and meditation.[154] Finally, Kostomarov reached the conclusion that "Regarding the manifestation of religiosity ... we can without further research easily define the main idea, penetrating the religious essence of a Little Russian. This idea is the absolute devotion to God's will."[155] Clearly, Kostomarov considered faith in God to be innate to Ukrainians.

2. Closeness to nature

For Kostomarov, another Ukrainian spiritual characteristic was a profound love for the beauty of nature. He thought that many Ukrainian folksongs were based on laws of aesthetic pleasure, derived from intercourse with nature and the experience of her beauty. In order to prove this claim, Kostomarov introduced the various symbolic meanings of many flowers, plants, and animals in Ukrainian folksongs. According to Kostomarov, such symbols contain the viewpoint of a people towards nature and profoundly express innate human characteristics. Symbols do not only address the intellect, emotions, and the spirit of a people, but also the way a people acts throughout their history: "The viewpoint of a people towards nature shows ... what a people is, and what kind of human existence it contains; and this leads to the understanding of further historical questions - why the people acted in such a way, and not in another."[156]

---

[153] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 12
[154] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 12.
[155] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 13.

Kostomarov believed that the symbolism reflected in Ukrainian songs was related to all aspects of nature. However, he said that in general, symbols in folklongs could be divided into five primary groups. These five groups consist of a) symbols of heavenly bodies and nature with their phenomena, b) symbols of terrain (or locality), c) symbols of the mineral kingdom, d) symbols of the vegetable kingdom, and e) symbols of the animal kingdom.[157] Kostomarov examined two groups of symbols concerning nature (those of the vegetable and animal kingdom) in "Ob istoricheskom znachenii russkoi narodnoi poezii."

Kostomarov subdivided the symbolism of the vegetable kingdom into two groups: a) flowers and herbs, and b) trees. According to him, the symbolism of flowers and herbs has three characteristics. First, it contains a certain impression of plants, especially flowers. Second, the symbolism shows the various applications of plants to family life, games and holidays. Finally, it reveals fantastic or traditional meanings based on legend and tradition. Kostomarov also divided the symbolism of trees into three groups according to: 1) impressions of their appearance; 2) the attributes (sprouts, flowers, stems, roots and others); and 3) their traditional meanings, which are conveyed in a system of metaphors.

---

[156] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 16.

[157] Kostomarov explained these symbols in "Istoricheskoe znachenie," pp. 439-692.

Kostomarov's study on symbolism mainly aimed to prove his two points. First, that Ukrainians are inclined to love the beauty of nature and that folksongs always reflected the close relationship Ukrainians have with nature. Second, that national differences had emerged from differences in the environment. In other words, the differences in environment and history among nations cause a differences in symbols.

In order to prove the closeness of Ukrainians to nature, Kostomarov identified many symbols which he saw as reflecting it. All types of human feelings, such as love, happiness, sadness, faithfulness, and others, are conveyed by a variety of symbols. He also asserted that Ukrainian symbols represent the cycle of life (fertility, death, and rebirth) as well as various events in family life (such as marriages, funerals, and holidays). Furthermore, Ukrainian symbols have fantastic and idealistic meanings, which are based on either folk legends or mythological tales. For Kostomarov, the characteristics of these symbols proved that Ukrainians had always been close to nature. They also indicated to him that Ukrainians tend to be idealistic in nature rather than practical. The following chart categorizes the various symbolic meaning of flowers, herbs, and trees, discussed by Kostomarov.

Flowers / Herbs / Trees	Meaning of the symbols
rozha (rose)	beauty, caress, gaiety, health
ruta (rue)	virginity, strictness of morality, platonic love
barvinok (periwinkle)	marriage
liubystok (lovage)	love
romen-zillia / *romashka* (camomile)	love
burkovina (melilotus)	faithfulness
vasylek (basil)	holiness, cleanness, cordiality, civility
khmel' (hop)	philandering, courage, boldness
mak (poppy)	decoration, luxurious clothing
bizh-derevo / *polyn* (wormwood)	a plant connected with *miata* and *barvinok*
son-trava (anemone)	symbol of mystery, dreaming, fortune-telling (mostly unhappy)
troi-zillia (mythological plant)	a flower which has healing power against desperate illness.
kalyna (cranberry)	beauty, virginity, and love
verba (willow)	assemblage, meeting
loza (osier, sallow, vine)	pitiful condition and poverty
iavir (sycamore, maple)	beautiful and sad tree, which is compared to an unhappy man
topolia (poplar)	stateliness, youthfulness
dub (oak)	masculinity
bereza (birch) / cut birch	virginity of bride / marriage union.
osyna / *osyka* (aspen)	mysterious strength
hrabyna / *hrab* (hornbeam, elm)	mythological meaning
iablunia (apple tree)	marriage of a bride

While describing these various symbols, Kostomarov discusses the differences between Ukraine and Russia. For example, *vasylek* (basil), which is often used in Ukraine with the symbolic meaning of holiness and cleanness, is also often mentioned in Russian folksongs. However, according to Kostomarov, Russian *vasylek* is a completely different flower. It corresponds to the Ukrainian *voloshky* (cornflower) of Little Russia.[158] Another example is *khmel'* (hop). *Khmel'* is the symbol of courage and boldness in Ukraine. Therefore, many cossack songs compare a courageous hero in battle to *khmel'*. However, in Russia, *khmel'* has a different symbolic meaning, indicating gaiety and hospitality.[159]

Kostomarov did not explain exactly why symbols are different among Ukrainians and Russians, and where these differences stem from. Moreover, this difference did not lead him to make any politicized generalization about Ukraine and Russia. However, Kostomarov thought that the differing environments of each nation had gradually led them to evolve into distinct national units.

> A man, living on the earth, has the closest relationship with the physical world, to which he belongs through half of his dual existence. That is why the existence of every nation is conditioned by its locality and the qualities of the surrounding of its nature. That is why in folksongs the nature of the land in which the people lived is visible; from them it is possible to discover to what degree the nation was connected with nature and what forms human sympathy to

---

[158] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," pp. 20-21.
[159] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 21.

> nature assumed. North and south, the mountain heights, ocean ripples, and all effects of various climates are drawn in folksongs.[160]

It is clear that even around 1843, Kostomarov's perception of the relationship between environment and national character led him to compare Ukrainian folksongs (which are the best source of information on national character) with those of Russia. However, it was not until he wrote "Dve russkiia narodnosti" in 1861, that he clearly stated that the difference between the two Russian nationalities arose from their different historical conditions.

> in the north-east, a new Slavic-Rus' nationality was created with its own character [and] with different conditions and aspects of life. Its beginning is traced from early years unknown to us; in the twelfth century, it evinced its existence with several salient features.[161]

In "Dve russkiia narodnosti," Kostomarov thoroughly investigated the Ukrainian relationship to Russians and drew a variety of comparisons between the two peoples. Concerning spiritual character and reverence for nature, Kostomarov said the following:

> Nature plays a small role in Great Russian song but a very great one in South Russian songs. South Russian poetry is inseparable from

---

[160] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 14.

[161] Kostomarv, "Dve russkiia narodnosti," *Sobrani sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova*, book 1, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1903), p. 47, cited in Jaroslaw Iwanus, "Democracy, Federalism, and Nationality: Ukraine's Medieval Heritage in the Thought of N. I. Kostomarov" (Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1986), p. 87.

> nature; it brings it alive and makes it a part of the joy and the grief of the human spirit. The grasses, the birds, the animals, the heavens, morning ... they all breathe, think, and feel together with mankind .... One can more or less see that Great Russian home and social life lacks the poetry of South Russian life, just as the latter has little that makes up the essence, the strength, and the value of the first. The Great Russians care little for nature. One very rarely sees flowers around the cottage of the Great Russian peasant, whereas one can find them around every house belonging to a South Russian.[162]

He also characterized the Russians as being very materialistic and practical while the Ukrainians were full of spiritualism and idealism: "The Great Russian people are inclined to materialism and lag behind the Ukrainians as far as spiritual life and poetry is concerned ... in Great Russia the people believe in devils, witches, demons - beliefs which they inherited from early times. They have very few fantastic tales; even devils and demons are materialistic in Great Russian tales."[163]

B. The historical character

By examining the Ukrainian historical songs in which cossacks were depicted as fighting for faith and homeland in his second dissertation, Kostomarov discovered the military aspects of Ukrainian historical life.

---

[162] Mykola Kostomarov, "Two Russian Nationalities," in *Towards an Intellectual History of Ukraine: An Anthology of Ukrainian Thought from 1710 to 1995*, ed. Ralph Lindheim and George S. N. Luckyj (Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1996), pp. 125-126.

[163] Doroshenko, "A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography," p. 138.

Kostomarov thought that the continuous struggles with enemies in Ukrainian history had formed the people's war-like character, which in turn was reflected in the historical songs. He argued that the Ukrainian historical songs were mainly military songs. Kostomarov divided the corpus of historical songs into three groups: the Turko-Tartar cycle, the Polish cycle, and the Russian cycle.

He further sub-divided the songs of the Turko-Tartar cycle into three groups: those concerning the cossack expedition to the Danube, those concerning cossack naval expeditions against the Turks, and those concerning the Tartars' raids and battles with Tartars on the open steppe. In the first group of the Turko-Tartar cycle, Kostomarov included songs about Prince Dmytro Vyshnevets'kyi, called Baida, who united the scattered groups of cossacks in the 1540s, founded cossack center (*Sich*) on the island of Khortytsia, and began the military organization of the cossacks.[164]

The second group of the Turko-Tartar cycle is concerned with the naval expeditions of the cossacks and the exploits of the brave men who passed the wide and deep sea, destroyed the pagans, and liberated their Christian brothers. According to Kostomarov, the *duma* about *Het'man* Samiilo Kishka (1600-2) holds an important place in the second group of the Turko-Tartar cycle.[165] Kishka wanted to secure the legalization of the cossacks and the renewal of part of their rights. He did this by using the opportunity presented by Poland's request for the cossacks' help in Moldavia and in the war against Sweden. Kostomarov thought that the *duma* was amazing because of its length and the distinctness of its images. He saw that it was an important record of the way of life of Ukrainians.

---

[164] According to a chronicle, Vyshnevets'kyi was captured once and beaten by the Turkish Sultan. The Sultan suggested Baida marry his daughter and offered him a principality in Ukraine. However, Baida rejected the Sultan's offer. Folksongs deal with this story. See Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii,"p. 51.

[165] This *duma* deals with the rescue of the cossack from captivity, the return from a military campaign, and the sharing of the spoils. See Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 53; P. Odarchenko, "The Dumas," in *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia* 1, p. 362; and *Ukrainian Dumy*, Trans. George Tarnawsky

According to Kostomarov, the most popular songs of the Turko-Tartar cycle were those concerning Tartar attacks and the cossacks' exploits against these enemies on the steppe. In this group were included the *dumy* concerned with Ivan Konovchenko,[166] Cossack Holota,[167] the escape of the brothers from Azov,[168] and others which are connected with historic events of the 17th century. Kostomarov also included in this group cossack songs

---

and Patricia Kilina (Toronto and Cambridge: Canadian Istitute of Ukrainian Studies and Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1979), pp. 46-63.

[166] In this *duma*, Ivan Konovchenko is a brave youth who volunteers for the cossack army. He is killed even though he has proven his ability to overcome hundreds of the enemy with no assistance. One of the reasons for his death is the curse of his mother, who wanted to keep him at home because he is the only man in the family. Therefore, one of the messages is that the mother should have understood Ivan's desire to fight for his country and that, rather than cursing him, she should have blessed him to protect him in battle. She should have accepted the precedence of service to homeland over family ties. See Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 53; and *Ukrainian Dumy*, pp. 8-12 and pp. 112-121.

[167] This song is about the duel of Cossack Holota with a Tartar.

[168] This *duma* is about the three brothers who escape from Azov. While fleeing from Turkish captivity, the two older brothers, riding on horseback, do not take care of the youngest and let him walk on foot all the time because they think at least two of them will have a chance to survive and live to serve their country in the future. However, they are not rewarded for this choice. In fact, in the *duma* they were punished by the wrath of God. The narrative's message, then, is that the brothers should have chosen loyalty to kin over the more desirable military option. See Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 53; and *Ukrainian Dumy*, pp. 11-12.

concerning family relations, which depict the parting of a cossack from his mother, wife, or lover.

The second cycle of historical songs is related to the period of struggle between the cossacks and the Poles. This cycle contains the *dumy* which concern the cossack revolts against Polish political and religious supremacy. Among the *dumy* of this cycle, Kostomarov paid special attention to *dumy* about Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and the events of 1648-1657. These *dumy* deal with actual historical events and describe historical personages in a vigorous spirit of victory. For example, Kostomarov analyzed the *duma* of Khmel'nyts'kyi and Barabash, which describes how Khmel'nyts'kyi obtained the king's letter from Barabash by ruse and how he became the *het'man*.

The third cycle (the Russian cycle) of Ukrainian historical songs contains those which concern the political and military history of the *het'many* under Russian rule. According to Kostomarov, after the annexation of cossack lands by Russia, the troubled relationship between the two peoples continued to incite the military activity of *het'many*. Cossacks, under the rule of Russia, continually provoked disagreements, discord, and disintegration among themselves. At that time, according to Kostomarov, Ukrainians were divided. Kostomarov discussed several *dumy* which reflect this difficult time. Here belong *dumy* about Ivan Vyhovs'kyi, Martyn Pushkar, and Iuri Khmel'nyts'kyi, in which the cossacks vacillated in their political allegiances.[169]

---

[169] Kostomarov wrote *The Ruin* concerning this confused period in 1879. According to Prymak, "while there are plenty of negative characters in this work, including several cossack leaders, there are no real heroes and few historical

Besides this, Kostomarov also deals with *dumy* concerning the period of Petro Doroshenko and *Het'man* Ivan Mazepa. Kostomarov concluded that after the fall of Mazepa the corpus of Ukrainian *dumy* becomes very thin. He believed that this was because Ukrainians entered a new stage of quiet civil life. However, he noted that the songs concerning the *haidamaka* revolt of 1768 and the destruction of the Zaporizhzhian Sich in 1775 still revealed the old Ukrainian cossack spirit.[170]

Through his examination of Ukrainian historical songs, Kostomarov reached this conclusion: "[the Little Russian] history of the later periods was fully and clearly reflected in folksongs; the flowers of fantasy did not have the power to cover the truth completely."[171] For Kostomarov, this (more historical and less fabulous) characteristic clearly distinguished the Ukrainian historical songs from those of the Russians. According to him, for the Great Russians, "on the contrary, not one of the historical events, which remained in the people's memory, is presented in the way that it really occurred; folk fantasy has altered everything in its own way."[172] Kostomarov reached this conclusion while discussing the corpus of Russian historical songs, which he divided into five distinct cycles: the ancient

---

judgments, especially about Ukrainian independence." See Prymak, *Mykola Kostomarov*, pp. 175-176.

[170] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," pp. 59-60.

[171] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 49.

[172] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 49.

songs,[173] songs of the Novgorod period,[174] songs of the Muscovite Tsardom, Don Cossack songs,[175] and soldiers' songs.[176]

Among these five cycles of Russian historical songs, Kostomarov paid great attention to the third cycle (songs of the Muscovite Tsardom) and compared those to the Ukrainian historical songs. Kostomarov thought that the spirit of autocracy (*samoderzhavie*) was spread throughout the Russian songs of this period.[177] The life of common people seemed to be subordinate to that of the tsar, and could not become the main theme of folksongs. For Kostomarov, autocracy was a striking characteristic of Russian historical life, which was not found in Ukrainian history.

---

[173] The ancient songs (*byliny*) dealing with Kyivan Rus' and the person of Prince Vladimir, were not found in the Ukrainian cycle and were much older than any Ukrainian historical songs. However, Kostomarov emphasized that they are not historical, but filled with confusion, marvels, and symbolism. Also a certain song of this group has even an anachronistic character: "Here we can see a strange mixture: Jerusalem, the Golden Horde, Greece, oversea countries, Chuds (Finns), the Latins, the Lutherans, Tartars, and finally such nations as never existed at all." See Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 61.

[174] Kostomarov characterized the songs of this group as imbued with the spirit of republicanism. Especially, rich people play a major role in the songs. Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 62.

[175] The main themes of Don Cossack songs are friendship and bold adventures of cossacks. According to Kostomarov, the story of T. Iermak's exploits hold an important place in the songs of this group. Besides this theme, there are also others about wars with Turks, the troubled time around the Don, and so on. Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 63.

[176] These songs depict the military campaigns of the later period. According to Kostomarov, these songs were important, but were still little-known. Kostomarov did not analyze these songs as carefully as the Don Cossack songs. Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 63.

[177] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 63. In order to prove the autocratic characteristic revealed in Great Russian songs, Kostomarov focused on songs concerning the period of Ivan Groznyi and emphasized that the memory of this period was not found in Ukrainian songs.

C. The social character.

As one of the main factors in the formation of national character, Kostomarov also dealt with the nature and variety of social classes and occupations. According to him, from the 16th to the 18th century, Ukrainian society consisted of various social groups, such as cossacks, *chumaky*,[178] *burlaky*,[179] peasants, *pany*,[180] Jews, and gypsies. Among those, Kostomarov distinguished two basic Ukrainian types: the cossack warrior and the agriculturist. However, he continued to say, during the transition period before the cossacks became peasants, two more types of social classes had appeared: the carter (*chumak*) and the vagrant (*burlak*). According to Kostomarov, in the 16th century when Ukraine woke up from its long lethargic dream, people began to live stormy and military lives and formed the cossacks. Afterwards, people entered a new stage of quiet civil life and their war-like character gradually declined. Then these people gradually managed their life as either *chumaky* or *burlaky*, and then finally as peasants.

---

[178] According to Kostomarov, *chumaky,* who engaged in the transportation of salt, bread, and so on, represent one of the most outstanding themes in Ukrainian occupational songs and have characteristics similar to those of the cossacks. See Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," pp. 77-81.

[179] Another Ukrainian type is the *burlak* - a landless peasant. Kostomarov said that in Ukrainian folksongs, *burlaky* are depicted as creatures who fatally accepts their suffering and recognize their own unhappiness. Therefore, he believed that *burlak* songs revealed the people's true opinion on human misery. See Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," pp. 81-83.

[180] *Pany* were the upper class landlords who were primarily Poles and Russians in Ukrainian territory and who had already taken up the Polish temper and character. See Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," pp. 94-96.

Kostomarov's study of the social character of Ukrainian life was based on the idea that a nation is the sum of its social classes and occupations. In his mind, the peculiar qualities of each social class or occupation affect the lives of all the members of a nation. The national amalgam of occupations which marks and distinguishes a nation also affects its general national life. In this regard, Kostomarov tried to analyze the particular character of each social class and to discover the national character which was shared by all four Ukrainian groups.

Cossacks, regarded by Kostomarov as the most representative Ukrainian type, revealed five basic characteristics in folksongs: "*vera*" (faith), "*liubov k rodine*" (love for the homeland), "*semeistvennost*" (attachment to family life), "*tovarishchestvo*" (fellowship), and "*voinstvennost*" (war-like character). According to Kostomarov, these five characteristics were expressed in folksongs mainly through two characters: Morozenko and Nechai. The former is an ideal cossack who has all the good traits of the ancient knights, such as bravery, nobility, generosity, absolute devotion to the homeland, fellowship, and so on. The latter is not the object of limitless respect, but a beautiful and loving creature. Kostomarov said that all Ukrainians identified with this figure and moaned over him as one would a faithful and obedient son.[181]

With the change of the social condition in the 18th century, the war-like spirit of the cossacks became weakened and peaceful social activities became more dominant. Also new social classes and occupations appeared. Kostomarov said that "the Little Russians finished their military vocation ...

---

[181] See Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," pp. 64-77.

times changed. The people, having pursued freedom for a long time, achieved it - it became necessary for the people to use its acquisition: the saber was replaced by the scythe and the gun was replaced by the plough."[182] However, Kostomarov argued that before the cossacks turned into peasants, they made the transition through the roles of *chumaky* and *burlaky*.[183] According to him, all the characteristics of the cossacks were integrated into the new social class and appeared in different spheres of peaceful activities. Pertaining to their work, *chumaky*, *burlaky*, and peasants were civil men, but each was still a cossack warrior in spirit and character.

Kostomarov presented the analogy that these four Ukrainian types reflected the course of Ukrainian history from the high summer of cossackdom to the cold winter of agricultural serfdom, through the autumn of the *chumak* and *burlak*: "The burning and noisy summer is replaced by a melancholic and pathetic autumn. In this way, the fiery and stormy cossackdom yielded its place to the wearisome and quiet world of *chumaky* and *burlaky*. However, autumn is short-lived: the cold winter soon replaces it. This peaceful time presents itself as somewhat strange for southern dwellers."[184] Connecting the four Ukrainian types to the course of Ukrainian history, Kostomarov believed that common people were always central figures not only in the Ukrainian folksongs but also in their own history.

By contrast, Kostomarov insisted that in Russian folksongs common people were depicted as marginal figures. According to him, the most important figure in the Russian folksongs was not the common people but the tsar, who is regarded as the reflection of God on earth. Kostomarov observed that "respect for the tsar was so great that the smallest sign of opposition was regarded as a crime, deserving death."[185] Also the relationship between the tsar and the common people was regarded as the same as that of father and son. Therefore, the happiness of the tsar became identified with the happiness of the whole people.

---

[182] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," pp. 77-78.
[183] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 78.
[184] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 83-84.

For Kostomarov, another notable difference between the social characteristics of the Ukrainians and the Russians was reflected in the ideas of the common people towards the ruling class. While Ukrainian lords (*pany*) were usually depicted as hostile figures in Ukrainian folksongs, members of the *boiar* class (Russian noble) were regarded as respectable figures in Russian songs, who occupied the first step below the tsar. Kostomarov also observed that Russian folksongs always generally dealt with family relations, ordinary Russians, the robber, and the Russian cossack only marginally.[186]

D. The political character

Kostomarov believed that democracy and federalism were inherent in the Ukrainian national character. Pertaining to the Ukrainian democratic character, he said, "Ukraine loved neither the tsar nor the Polish lord and established a Cossack Host amongst themselves."[187] Glorifying the cossack period, Kostomarov declared, "the Cossacks were all equal amongst themselves, and officials were elected at assembly and they all had to serve, all according to the word of Christ, because they accepted the duty as compulsory, as an obligation, and there was no sort of seigniorial majesty and title among the Cossacks."[188]

---

[185] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 102.
[186] See Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," pp. 105-113.
[187] M. Kostomarov, "Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People," in *Kostomarov's "Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People,"* Trans. Yanivs'kyi, p. 40.

He also emphasized the federalist characteristic: "Ukraine wanted again to live fraternally with Poland .... then Ukraine joined Moscovy and united with her as one Slavic people with another Slavic people ... but Ukraine soon perceived that she had fallen into captivity."[189] However, Kostomarov continued to envision Ukrainians as living with other Slavic peoples in brotherhood. Therefore, he insisted on the political unification of all the Slavic peoples in the form of a federation of Slavic nations, each with its own self-government.

Contrasting Russian and Ukrainian attitudes toward relations between the individual and the group, and towards property, Kostomarov also explained the differences in social character and system of the two peoples.

> In their social beliefs the Great Russians are different from Ukrainians as a result of their different historical heritage. The urge to unite individual parts into a whole, the denial of personal interests in the name of social good, the highest respect for social judgment - all these features manifest themselves in the large family life of the Great Russians and in their sacrifices for the community (mir). A Great Russian family is one unit, with property in common...
>
> The Ukrainians, on the other hand, hate this system ... A common

---

[188] Kostomarov, "Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People," p. 40.
[189] Kostomarov, "Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People," p. 42.

> duty, not voluntarily undertaken but inevitable, they regard as a great burden, while among the Great Russians these duties substitute for their strivings for personal liberty.
>
> Compulsory common use of the land and responsibility of all for one appear to a Ukrainian to be the worst and most unjust kind of servitude. His history has not taught him to suppress his feelings for private property or to regard himself as a servant of some abstract commune and be responsible for other members of it.[190]

Whereas Kostomarov thought and wrote most extensively on the similarities and differences between Ukrainians and Russians, he also compared the national character of Ukrainians and Poles in some respects. "If, linguistically, Ukrainians are less close to the Poles than they are to the Great Russians, in national character they are more akin to the Poles."[191] However, according to Kostomarov, "Poles and Ukrainians are like two branches growing in opposite directions."[192] The Ukrainians are allegedly democratic whereas the Poles are aristocratic; although the Polish aristocracy is "very democratic" while the Ukrainian democracy was "very aristocratic." He continued that the Polish nobility has tried to remain within the limitations of its own class. On the other hand, in Ukraine, "the people have equal status and rights and often produce individuals who climb much higher ... but in turn are again absorbed by the mass of the people from which they stem."[193]

---

[190] Doroshenko, "A Survey of Ukrainina Historiography," pp. 138-139.
[191] Doroshenko, "A Survey of Ukrainina Historiography," p. 139.
[192] Doroshenko, "A Survey of Ukrainina Historiography," p. 139.
[193] Doroshenko, "A Survey of Ukrainina Historiography," p. 139.

Chapter V. Kostomarov's re-creation of Ukrainian history

Through his attempt to discover the religious, historical, and social character of Ukrainians in his second dissertation (1843), Kostomarov could distinguish the Ukrainian nationality from that of the Russian one. Until this time, his study remained in the cultural stage and did not go far beyond the sphere of identifying national characteristics and symbols in folklore. At that time, Kostomarov began to attribute the democratic-federalist political character to the Ukrainian people and incorporate this into his definition of Ukrainian identity. This key characteristic is associated with the development of Kostomarov's own understanding of the link between folklore and national pursuits.

According to Herder, "the most natural state is one people with one national character."[194] Therefore, it seemed to Herder that the mixture of various nations within one country was unnatural. For Herder, collecting the old folk poetry surviving from the pervious time was an attempt to restore to the nation its national soul, and thus to make possible its future development on its own foundation.[195] In other words, Herder aimed to use folksongs for creating German national identity and to unify the country. The link between folklore and national pursuits became clearer to Kostomarov around 1846, when he organized the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius. His thoughts on this matter were fully developed by 1861, when he wrote "Dve russkiia narodnosti," in which he clearly defined Ukrainian identity.

---

[194] Wilson, *Folklore and Nationalism in Modern Finland*, pp. 28-29.

[195] Wilson, *Folklore and Nationalism in Modern Finland*, p. 30.

In 1846 when the Brotherhood was organized, Kostomarov wrote a political work under the title of *Knyhy bytiia ukrains'koho narodu*, which was the most interesting document connected with the Brotherhood. In this work, Kostomarov argued explicitly for the democratic and federalist political character of Ukrainians and declared the political rights of Ukraine based on four principles: Christian morality, democracy, Slavic community, and Ukrainian messianism. The latter, unlike Russian and Polish messianism, preached the equality of all Slavic peoples.[196]

In "Dve russkiia narodnosti," Kostomarov clearly stated his view of the differences which exist between Ukrainians and Russians, and explained the Ukrainian religious (or spiritual), historical, social, and political character, elaborating for the first time a complete description of Ukrainian identity.

Judging from the analysis above, it can be said that the development of the Ukrainian national identity was a dynamic process. According to Krawchenko, "when cultural distinctiveness becomes an important factor for a people's social, economic and political demands, the people typically need a measure of effective control over the behavior of their members, which could be a formal social or political organization."[197] In Ukraine, it was clearly Kostomarov who led this dynamic process. After 1846, Kostomarov shifted the level of his folklore study away from collecting national characteristics and symbols to using them for political purposes. Linking his folklore study with nationalist pursuits, Kostomarov clearly defined Ukrainians as a discrete group and finally claimed political rights for Ukraine in the first Ukrainian political organization, the Brotherhood.

---

[196] E. Borschak, "Shevchenko and the Brotherhood of SS. Cyril and Methodius," in *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia* 1, p. 676.

[197] Krawchenko, *Social Change and National Consciousness*, p. xviii.

Having identified Ukrainian character, Kostomarov began to reconstruct the history of the Ukrainian people, using folk materials. In the initial phase, his study of national history was motivated by a somewhat nostalgic mood. Eventually, however, moving from the cultural stage to the political, his study was conducted in order to spread national consciousness and to give the people a sense of community. In fact, since Ukraine did not exist as a state at that time, the re-creation of Ukrainian history was essential to encourage people to identify with their nation. Therefore, Kostomarov glorified the past, especially the cossack period, while extending Ukrainian history from the pre-historic period to the present time. Considering Subtelny's statement that "an extended history gave people a sense of continuity, a feeling that the current sad state of their nation was but a passing phase,"[198] we can imagine how important Kostomarov's task to reconstruct Ukrainian history was.

Since Kostomarov placed the common people at the center of history, he regarded folk materials, which reflect the viewpoint of a people on history, as the best source of historical reference. His attempt to record the Ukrainian history on the basis of folk materials was obvious in his two works: "Ob istoricheskom znachenii russkoi narodnoi poezii," (1843), revised and elaborated in "Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhnorusskogo narodnogo pesennogo tvorchestva," (1872, 1880-83).

In the former, Kostomarov pointed out that the Ukrainian historical songs were more varied than those of the Russians. Also, the Ukrainian songs were more historical and less fabulous than those of the Russians, and the Ukrainian songs were filled up with democratic elements, while Russian songs were replete with the spirit of autocracy. In the final chapter of this work, dealing with the social life of the Ukrainian and Russian people as revealed in their folksongs, Kostomarov stated that the Russian folk poetry was dominated by the figure of the tsar, while the Ukrainian poetry by that of the cossack warrior, *chumak*, *burlak*, and the agriculturalist. Through this contrast, Kostomarov tried to explain the democratic character of the cossack past, which he regarded as the inheritance of Kyivan Rus'.

---

[198] Subtelny, *Ukraine*, pp. 225-226.

In his article "Mysli o federativnom nachale v drevnei Rusi," Kostomarov argued that it was Ukraine, and not Russia, that had the primary claim to the heritage of Kyivan Rus'. First of all, he discussed the problem of the meaning of the name "Rus'" and stated that it originally had a territorial and ethnic meaning in South Rus' but merely a political, and later ecclesiastical meaning in the north.[199] Then he stated that the Rus' State consisted of a federation of six nationalities, such as Ukrainian, Severian, Russian, Belarusian, the people of Pskov, and the people of Novgorod. Until the middle of the twelfth century the Rus' people remained independent in their own lands, yet were still united in this federation, by having one language, one religion, and similar customs.[200] However, after the Tartar invasion, the whole system of social and political life was completely changed. According to Kostomarov, while the cossacks still inherited the character of Kyivan Rus', Russia lost it since the Russians had a new type of national character which emerged out of the mixture of the early Finnish and Slavic tribes of the Northeast, and a new physical climate.[201] Kostomarov argued for a connection between Kyivan Rus' and cossack Ukraine in his attempt to show the continuity of national characteristics and forms of social structure in all periods of Ukrainian history. After all, Kostomarov insisted that the Ukrainians, who had inherited the democratic-federalist national character, should rightfully be the successors of the Kyivan Rus'.

---

[199] Prymak, "Mykola Kostomarov and East Slavic Ethnography," p. 179.

[200] Kostomarov, "Mysli o federativnom nachale," *Sobranie Sochinenie N. I. Kostomarov*, book 1, vol. 1, pp. 3-4, 13, 18-19, cited in Doroshenko, "A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography," p. 137.

In "Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhno-russkogo narodnogo pesennogo tvorchestva," Kostomarov divided Ukrainian history into four periods (Pre-historic, Princely or Pre-cossack, Cossack, and Post-cossack or Peasant periods). He tried to show the continuity of certain national characteristics throughout the whole of Ukrainian history, explaining the Ukrainian historical process by means of ethnographic determinism. In the following section, I intend to examine how Kostomarov understood the Ukrainian historical process.

A. The pre-historic period

According to Kostomarov, the information on the pagan ancestors of the Ukrainian people and their pre-Christian religions is very scanty and unclear: "About most of these divinities (pre-Christian gods) and in general mythological names, it is difficult to say definitively if they were folk deities or borrowings, or if they were respected by the masses or only by one class of a people."[202] However, Kostomarov believed that some elements of the pre-Christian religion and the people's views of life were preserved until his own time in folklore, especially folksongs, by means of symbols and myths.

---

[201] Prymak, "Mykola Kostomarov and East Slavic Ethnography," p. 180.

As I discussed in the previous chapter, Kostomarov regarded the symbolization of nature as the significant and predominant characteristic of poetic expression in Ukrainian folksongs. Kostomarov continued to say that "under the name of a symbol we understand the figurative expression of moral ideas by means of various objects of physical nature, and moreover a more or less certain spiritual characteristic (quality) is imparted to these objects."[203] Along with symbols, Kostomarov also regarded myths, which were powerful social forces, (often connected with a person's religion, and as such, associated with ritual and ceremony), as the source of the ancient people's view of nature. For him, "myths and symbols cause and mutually produce each other. A myth, combined with a certain object of physical nature in a person's consciousness, imparts to this object constant presence of the religious (or spiritual) meaning, which is contained in the myth itself."[204]

Regarding Ukrainian folksongs as much more rich and important sources of ancient symbols and myths than any other Slavic songs, (especially the Great Russians'), Kostomarov divided symbolism into four categories: 1) symbolism of heavenly bodies and aerial phenomena, 2) symbolism of earth, terrain, and water, 3) symbolism of plants, and 4) symbolism of animals. In the first category, Kostomarov discussed the symbolic and mythological meaning of the sun, moon, stars, wind, clouds, rain, fog, dew, thunder, snow, etc., which were often used in Ukrainian folksongs. He continued to explain many symbols and myths of the second category, such as the earth, grave, mountain, valley, steppe, road, sand, stone, gold and silver, water, river, and sea. In the third and forth categories which had been already examined in Kostomarov's earlier work, he included many kinds of grasses, flowers, bushes, trees, birds, horses, and fishes.

---

[202] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 439.
[203] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," pp. 439-440.
[204] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 440.

Through the entire process of his study on symbolism, Kostomarov wanted to explain man's proximity to nature by stating that "ancient man, whose sensitivity to the phenomena of nature was stronger," was "accustomed to seeing himself in the whole nature and not to separating himself from nature."[205] Therefore, according to him, ancient man "united special signs and phenomena of the moral world with the phenomena and objects of nature, which stood out in a person's contemplation."[206] Kostomarov thought that closeness to nature was the distinctive characteristic of ancient people, which was also inherent to later Ukrainians. This characteristic seems to furnish Kostomarov with the evidence needed for his statement that the Ukrainians care much for nature while the Russians care little for it, and that Little Russians, who inherited this national character, should be the successors of Kyivan Rus' or even earlier ancestors in that area.[207]

---

[205] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 440.
[206] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 440.
[207] See Doroshenko, "A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography," pp. 137-139.

Concerning the mythology of the pre-historic period, Kostomarov left two major writings: "Slavianskaia mifologiia"[208] (Slavic mythology), (1847), and "Neskol'ko slov o slaviano-russkoi mifologii"[209] (Several words on the Slavic-Russian Mythology), (1872).[210] In the latter, Kostomarov mentions the differences and similarities among Slavs: "In the Slavic world, there was much in common, but there were also many differences, belonging to one but alien to other tribes … there was little communication between peoples … therefore, it was natural that its local features appeared in each branch."[211] Kostomarov believed that there were sharp distinctions especially between Western and Eastern Slavs. For example, Baltic Slavs had more advanced and complex religions, temples, and rituals than did the Russians. However, the conclusions of both of his works ended with the emphasis on the similarity between East Slavs and other Slavs.

> If we add to all this the similarity between the rituals of other Slavs and ours, and especially the similarity between fortune-telling by

---

[208] N. I. Kostomarov, *Slavianskaia mifologiia* (Kyiv: Bainer, 1847), reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 203-40. [I am using the latter publication in this thesis.]

[209] N. I. Kostomarov, "Neskol'ko slov o slaviano-russkoi mifologii," in *Russkiia Drevnosti*, ed., V. Prokhorov, book 1 (1872), pp. 1-24, reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, p. 283-98. [I am using the latter publication in this thesis.]

[210] In both works concerning Slavic mythology, Kostomarov discussed the feast days on the calendar of the pagan Slavs, pagan rites, customs, and general questions of Slavic mythology. Kostomarov believed that ancient Slavic mythology was a natural religion and stressed the importance of the cult of the sun and of celestial bodies, thus claiming that the ancient Slavs anticipated the purer monotheism of later times. For more explanations of Kostomarov's Slavic mythology, see Prymak, "Mykola Kostomarov and East Slavic Ethnography," p. 173.

[211] Kostomarov, "Neskol'ko slov o slaviano-russkoi mifologii," p. 286.

> means of the horse near Svantovit's temple and our fortune-telling, and the similarity between the harvest festival in Arkon and the custom in Little Russia before Christmas holidays, we undoubtedly recognize: 1) that our mythology was incomparably richer than Nestor represented; 2) that our mythology had a close relationship with the mythology of the western Slavs, so that in essence it was the same thing.[212]

His study of Slavic mythology, which often accompanied his folklore study, clearly shows his pious attitude toward religion and Slavic antiquity. Commonalties in Slavic mythology seem to have influenced his later Slavophile inclinations not only in his cultural but also in his political activities. Later on, his Slavophile tendency was expressed in an incomplete story *Panych Natalych*[213] (Young nobleman Natalych), (1847), in which the protagonist of the story is not the hero, Natalych, but rather the Slavophile ideas themselves.[214] Moreover, Kostomarov strongly insisted on federalism as a political claim for Ukrainians: "All Slavic peoples should be allowed to develop their cultures freely and, more important, they should form a Slavic federation with democratic institutions akin to those of the United States. The capital of this federation is to be Kiev."[215]

---

[212] Kostomarov, "Slavianskaia Mifologiia," p. 240.

[213] This is an unfinished story. The texts of both *Panych Natalych* and Kostomarov's note on Panslavism are given in *Kyrylo-Mefodiivske Tovarystvo* 1 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1990), pp. 262-4. For more information, see Prymak, *Mykola Kostomarov*, pp. 43-44.

[214] Ivancevich, "Ukrainian National Movement," p. 340.

[215] Subtelny, *Ukraine*, p. 236.

B. The princely or pre-cossack period

According to Kostomarov, between the pre-historic and the cossack periods, there existed the princely period, which was characterized by the acceptance of Christianity and the *kniaz'-veche* political system. In spite of the Christianization of Rus', Kostomarov believed that people were still under the influence of natural religions. The relationship of the people to nature and the ways of poetic expression had not changed much and lasted through the princely period up to the present time. Therefore, he said, "the very fact that in contemporary songs there are traces of times more ancient than the princely period gives us the right to recognize as logically unquestionable that these traces existed in the period between older antiquity and centuries closer to our times."[216]

In this regard, Kostomarov considered *Slovo o polku Igoreve*[217] (The tale of Igor's armament) an important source, which shows "striking internal similarity with South Russian folk poetry."[218] According to Kostomarov, "in the twelfth century, the singer (of *Slovo*) drew his own inspiration from the same source, from which our (Ukrainian) songs flowed."[219] He continued to say that "the folk poetry of the previous centuries became an ancestral mother (model) of the poetry of later years and later handed over to them many of its expressions as a whole."[220] As some examples of these expressions, Kostomarov introduced the following: the conversion of a woman into a cuckoo bird, the dispute between the horse and the eagle, and so on.

---

[216] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 677.
[217] It is not known precisely when or by whom the *Slovo* was first composed. It survived until the nineteenth century in only one anonymous manuscript copy made in the region of Pskov around 1500 and discovered in the early 1790's by Count Aleksei Musin-Pushkin. For more information, see Robert Mann, *Lances Sing: A Study of the Igor Tale* (Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1989), p 1.
[218] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 678.
[219] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 678.

While Kostomarov explained the *Slovo*'s close relationship with the oral traditions of the pre-historic period and cossack period, in terms of its closeness to nature and its way of expression, he also noted some discontinuity of poetic feeling, philosophy, and method. He thought that it was caused by the change of historical circumstances.

> The following generations of peoples, borrowing from the previous generations not only the poetic worldview but also poetic devices, and feeling in the same manner that ancestors felt, could not, however, empathize with everything that these ancestors did in their times, nor relate with the same participation to the phenomena, which due to the changed historical circumstances could no longer repeat themselves.[221]

In the preface to this work, Kostomarov had already mentioned that songs undergo those changes which a people have experienced throughout their lives. He said, "according to the way conditions of the previous but already changed structure of life stop affecting the people, they stop affecting the people's heart and expression in the song, having run out of the feeling obtained under the influence of that structure, and are forgotten."[222] As an example of these phenomena, Kostomarov mentioned the memories of the Volodymyr period. According to him, "the memory of the period of Vladimir and more generally on the Kyivan period has disappeared in South Rus' and left for Great Rus'."[223] Kostomarov supposed that the stormy political life of the Ukrainian lands was responsible for this disappearance. In contrast, the memory of the princely period remained in Great Russian folksongs primarily because Russian history was characterized by continuity and slow change.

---

[220] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 678.
[221] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 678.
[222] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 438.

Concerning the disappearance of the memory of Kyivan Rus' in Ukrainian folksongs, Kostomarov considered whether songs such as *Slovo* were the property of the common people or not. In his opinion, such songs belonged not to the common people but to the upper class and did not reflect the interests and the ideas of the masses: "it is true that the singer of *Igor* stands above a *druzhynnik* (member of prince's armed force); according to his wide view he (the singer) is a man of the land, but at the same time, objects which interest him are not of the common people: whatever that poetry is like, we do not see that it is the expression of any active aspirations of the common people."[224] Especially after the thirteenth century when the political system of Rus' became characterized by the despotism and aristocracy of *kniaz'* and *boiar*, the memory of that period could not remain in cossack songs, which reflect the aspiration and idealism of the common people.

Here Kostomarov explained the gap between the princely times and the cossack period: "between the cossack period and preceding times an abyss arose. The South Russian nation could seem not to be the people coming directly from the previous generations living on the same land, but rather a new nation coming from somewhere else."[225] Therefore, he said, "it is not surprising to us that the people did not show any tender feelings towards the memory of these princes of theirs and even forgot about their existence. The lords and the gentry, which the people fought, were the direct regeneration of princedoms and their retinue of previous times."[226] In this way, Kostomarov emphasized the anti-despotic and anti-aristocratic character of the common people who came to play the leading role in the cossack period.

---

[223] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 678.
[224] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 679.

Even though Kostomarov stated that Ukrainians seemed to be a new nation, in his other works he insisted that they were the successors of the cultural and political tradition of Kyivan Rus'. Finding a certain element of freedom and democracy in the *veche* election of the *kniaz'*, Kostomarov insisted that the cossacks' tradition of electing their leaders in an unstructured way was clearly evidence that Ukrainian people were the inheritors of the democratic tradition of Kyivan Rus'.[227] Concerning the federalist tradition, Kostomarov also insisted that Kyiv was not the centralized and monarchic capital but instead the center of federative states. For Kostomarov, this federative principle was also evident in the cossack period. He said that Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi's attempt to join cossack Ukraine with tsarist Russia in 1654 was intended to re-establish the federal relationship between the two peoples.[228] According to Kostomarov, because of the Mongol invasion, Russia lost its democratic and federalist traditions. Therefore, for Kostomarov, the Ukrainian people were the rightful successors of Kyivan Rus'.

---

[225] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 680.

[226] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 680

[227] See Kostomarov, "Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People," p. 40: "officials were elected at the assembly ... there was no sort of seigniorial majesty and title among the Cossacks ...." Also see Iwanus, "Democracy, Federalism, and Nationality," pp. 85-86.

C. The cossack period

In "Istoriia kozachestva v pamiatnikakh iuzhnorusskikh narodnykh pesniakh"[229] (The history of cossackdom in the monuments of South Russian folksong creations), Kostomarov attempted to write a history of the cossack period based on the folksongs. In order to reveal the people's memories or viewpoints on historical events, Kostomarov divided the cossack period into two parts: the period of fighting against the Islamic world and the period of fighting against the Poles. While arranging folksongs in historical sequence with appropriate commentaries, Kostomarov tried to explain the following subjects: 1) the connection between the previous and cossack periods, 2) cossacks' characteristics, such as love of freedom, brotherhood, loyalty to comrades, self-sacrifice for the prosperity of Ukraine, anti-aristocratism, and others, and 3) the people's viewpoint on historical figures and events.

---

[228] Iwanus, "Democracy, Federalism, and Nationality," p. 86. In 1654, B. Khmel'nyts'kyi signed a written treaty with Muscovy. Under this treaty Ukraine accepted the protection of the Muscovite tsar, but still remained a separate body politic, preserving its own socio-political and ecclesiastical order, its own army, its own central and local governments. However, the Moscow government wished to secure a firm position in Ukraine and tried to annex the whole of Ukraine and Belarus. Therefore, for many Ukrainians, the Pereiaslav treaty was regarded as the cause for losing their freedom. See *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia* 1, pp. 640-642.

[229] This work was published in serial form in *Russkaia mysl'* (1880-1883). This was reprinted in *Sobranie Sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova* in 1905 and in 1967, being a part of "Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhno-russkogo narodnogo pesennogo tvorchestva."

Concerning the connection between the previous and the cossack period, Kostomarov focused on the *duma* about Oleksii Popovych from Pyriatyn.[230] According to Kostomarov, the name "Oleksii Popovych" or "Aleksandr Popovych" (in chronicles) was of ancient origin. He went on to say that this half-mythological hero was one of the *bogatyrs* of the *bylina* "Vladimir Krasnoe Solnyshko." Kostomarov believed that this ancient name had been transmitted from the Kyivan period and still remained in Ukrainian folksongs: "This ancient name also passed into the Little Russian poetry of the cosssack period and attached itself to the *duma*, which belongs to the category of religious-moral songs according to its basic idea, when a singer reciting them before the people had as his goal to arouse among his listeners pious meditations about a reward for virtue and punishment for vice."[231]

In the latter part of this *duma*, Oleksii Popovych cuts the little finger from his right hand. After he lets his Christian blood flow into the Black Sea, a long and dangerous wave of the Black Sea begins to subside and the cossack boats land onto the beach safely. According to Kostomarov, "the purely Christian idea on the power of confession before God is mixed together with a purely pagan one, that of appeasing the infuriated deep sea with a man's blood."[232] Using such examples, Kostomarov tries to demonstrate the continuity of Ukrainian history from pagan times through the Kyivan period to the cossack era.

---

[230] See Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," pp. 694-697.
[231] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 695.
[232] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 697.

While arranging folksongs according to historical sequence, Kostomarov showed that Ukrainian *dumy* have a variety of themes. Concerning the *dumy* about the struggle against the Tartars and the Turks, Kostomarov described several *dumy* which contain the following themes: the suffering in Turkish captivity, the heroic death of a cossack, the rescue of the cossack from captivity and return to the homeland, and so on. Also pertaining to the *dumy* having to do with the conflicts between the Ukrainian cossacks and the Poles, Kostomarov introduced *dumy* on the Khmel'nyts'kyi period and on the period after the death of Khmel'nytskyi. According to Kostomarov, these *dumy* tell of various historical events and also reveal the character of cossacks, as being freedom-loving and anti-aristocratic.

Using one of the *dumy* which reveal the freedom-loving character of the cossacks, Kostomarov dealt with the *duma* about Samiilo Kishka, who had been captured and imprisoned by the Turks for years and then freed himself along with other cossacks. According to Kostomarov, this kind of *duma* "presented to people's imagination and feelings images of heroes who escaped from terrible captivity in some kind of unusual way."[233] Besides this *duma*, Kostomarov also introduced two more *dumy* which have similar content and theme: the *duma* about Ivan Bohuslavets' and the *duma* about Marusia from Bohuslav in which the heroes free all of the cossacks being held in Turkish captivity. According to Kostomarov, these *dumy* also show the virtues of freedom and proclaim that freedom is a most valuable thing.

More characteristics of the cossacks, identified by Kostomarov, were anti-aristocratism, anti-monarchism, or even anarchism. While commenting on *dumy* about Baida, Kostomarov emphasized these characteristics of Vyshnevets'kyi (Baida): "he did not really obey high authority and did not really value its mercy for him. He went to fight of his own will, joined to serve the Muscovite sovereign of his own will and abandoned him of his own will."[234] Kostomarov continued to say that "the cossack military, which was under his command, was the armed force neither of the princes nor of the landowners ... it was more likely a free band, which voluntarily recognized prince Vyshnevets'kyi as its favorite leader. It did not like Lithuanian landowners nor the Lithuanian Grand Prince, even less so the Polish landowners nor Poland's Grand Prince. By shunning Polish and Lithuanian matters, it stood alone by itself in its own Ukraine."[235]

---

[233] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 701

Besides these characteristics of cossacks, Kostomarov also introduced several other characteristics, such as brotherhood, loyalty to comrades, and self-sacrifice for the prosperity of Ukraine. For Kostomarov, these characteristics of cossacks reflected in folksongs would be the basis of his interpretation of the nature of the cossack period. The following paragraph, which is cited from *Knyhy bytiia ukrains'koho narodu*, reflects Kostomarov's perception of the nature of the Cossack period.

> And day after day the Cossack Host grew and multiplied and soon all people in Ukraine would have become Cossacks, i.e., free and equal, and there would have been neither a tsar nor a Polish lord over Ukraine, but God alone ... in Ukraine there appeared brotherhoods

---

[234] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 730

[235] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," pp. 730-731.

> such as there were among the first Christians; and each person on enrolling in the brotherhood, whether he had been a master or a slave was called a brother. And this was so that all might see that in Ukraine the ancient, true faith remained and that in Ukraine there were no idols and for this reason no types of heresies appeared there.[236]

Basically, for Kostomarov, the nature of the cossack period was explained by the sum of the cossacks' characteristics revealed in the folksongs. Kostomarov idealized cossackdom as the historical period of the common people, filled with equality, freedom, brotherhood, faith, and democratic elements.

Kostomarov tried to explore the viewpoint of the common people on historical events and figures as reflected in folksongs. Among some distinguished historical figures in the cossack period, Kostomarov paid special attention to Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and analyzed the people's view on him based on folksongs. According to Kostomarov, Khmel'nyts'kyi was depicted in folksongs not only as a respectable figure, but also as an enemy especially after the 1650s, when Hetmanate territory was destroyed by the failure of serial treaties with Poland and Russia.[237]

---

[236] Kostomarov, "Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People," p. 41.

[237] In 1651, after a battle took place between the cossacks and the Poles, a peace agreement was reached under the name of the Pact of Bila Tserkva. According to this Pact, the cossacks were allowed only the province of Kiev and were permitted to live only on the royal domains. This Pact put Khmel'nyts'kyi in a very difficult position. Also, popular resentment against Khmel'nyts'kyi grew. See *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia* 1, p. 639. Concerning the Pereiaslav treaty in 1654, see footnote 228.

Concerning the situation before and after 1654, Kostomarov introduced one song which shows the people's view of that time. Kostomarov said, "in it (this song) the former grief of poor Ukraine was represented: it had nowhere to go; the horde stamped small children under their horses, cut down old people, and drove the adults into captivity. Then it is said on behalf of a Ukrainian, that he formerly served a Catholic landowner, but now he is not going to serve him forever; he also served the Islamic lord, but now he is going to serve the eastern tsar."[238] Kostomarov continued to explain the last scene of this song: "The song ends with such a scene: A *liakh* (Pole) is walking in a market and holding a sabre, but the cossack does not fear the *liakh*, he does not take off his cap before him. The *liakh* seizes a lash and the cossack a club: [then, the cossack said] here you are, son of the enemy, you will be separated from your spirit!"[239]

According to Kostomarov, around 1653, people thought that their painful situations originated from Khmel'nyts'kyi's mistakes in politics. From this moment, several songs began to depict Khmel'nyts'kyi as an enemy. The following song is one of the examples of this:

Oh, may God grant that the first bullet
Would not miss Khmel'-Khmel'nyts'kyi!
For ordering to take boys and girls,
And young married women.
The boys are going and singing,
And the girls are crying,
And the young married women

---

[238] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," pp. 848-849.
[239] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 849.

Cursing old Khmel':
Wish that the first bullet
Would not miss Khmel' Khmel'nyts'kyi.[240]

What is worth noticing concerning this song is that Kostomarv also had negative opinions about Bohdan Khmel'nytsikyi. He thought that Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi acted either out of personal interest or in the narrow interests of the cossack *starshyna* (cossack officers).[241] According to Doroshenko, "Kostomarov failed to recognized the great efforts made by Khmel'nyts'kyi to organize a state, and in his monograph the figure of that great *het'man* appears weak and lifeless."[242] Even though it is not clear that Kostomarov's historical view on Khmel'nyts'kyi was influenced by the common people's views presented in folksongs, it is true that Kostomarov came to depict Khmel'nyts'kyi and the later cossack *het'many* in dark colors, so did common people in their folksongs.[243] After all, in many of his works, such as "Mysli o federativnom nachale v drevnei Rusi," "Dve russkiia narodnosti," and "Cherty narodnoi iuzhno-russkoi istorii,"[244] (Characteristics of national history of South Russia), (1861), Kostomarov de-emphasized the importance of the work of the *het'many*, even that of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and emphasized the spontaneous character of the popular movements and the freedom-loving democratic spirit of the Ukrainian people.

---

[240] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie," p. 849.

[241] For the information of Kostomarov's treatment of Khmel'nyts'kyi, see Prymak, *Mykola Kostomarov*, pp. 72-74: "he is old and experienced rather than young and dashing, cold and calculating rather than warm and exuberant, cunning and reserved rather than honest and open." (p. 73.)

[242] Doroshenko, "A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography," pp. 143-144.

[243] For examples of this, see N. I. Kostomarov, 'Mazepa i Mazepintsy,' in *Russkaia mysl* (1882-1884), cited in Prymak, *Mykola Kostomarov*, pp. 176-177: "In folk-songs and legends he (Mazepa) was some kind of evil and inimical being; he was not even a man but an evil accursed power: 'Cursed Mazepa!'." (p. 177.)

[244] N. I. Kostomarov, "Cherty narodnoi iuzhno-russkoi istorii," *Osnova* (1861), reprinted in *Sobranie sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova*, book 1, vol. 1, pp. 67-158.

D. The post-cossack or peasant period.

The cossack period, which was one of the most important and fruitful times in the history of Ukraine, ended in the late 18th century. After the victory over Turkey in the war of 1769-74, Russia had acquired control over wide areas of land north of the Black Sea, and needed to occupy the territory of Zaporizhzhia, which barred Russian access to them. For these reasons, Russia decided to destroy the Zaporizhzhian Sich. When the Russian army suddenly attacked in 1775, the *Sich* ceased to exist. The Zaporizhzhian cossacks were dispersed.

According to Kostomarov, after the cossacks were dispersed, a new era of Ukrainian history began. He called this era the post-cossack or peasant period, which was different from the cossack period in terms of class and occupation, but was similar to it in the spirit and character of the people. Kostomarov believed that in this period, the peasant replaced the cossacks, *chumaky*, and *burlaky*, and absorbed all of their characteristics. Kostomarov argued, "in former times, our nationality presented itself in various parts; now every division, all provinciality must be wiped out by education. Those classes of the people, which already taste the fruit of new life, do not know local distinctions [features] … In the present time the whole Little Russian element was concentrated into the common class of country bumpkins."[245]

Based on the folk materials, Kostomarov further divided the peasant period into two parts. The first part is compared to the age of a peasant's youth (*parubotsstvo*). According to Kostomarov, this period was characterized by a peasant's carefree life, fantasy devoted to feeling, and passion. In folksongs, he said, the beauty of a youth is depicted by the term "cossack." The second part begins from the moment when the peasant marries. In this period, "he becomes reasonable and prosaic; (his) feelings are suppressed by the difficulty of (his) worries and labors, and (his) passions die out under the cold reckonings of family life."[246]

While making an analogy between the course of Ukrainian history and the four seasons, Kostomarov compared agricultural serfdom, the most recent segment of Ukrainian history, to the cold winter. Even though Kostomarov regarded the post-cossack period as the cold winter of Ukrainian history, he saw this period in a positive perspective and predicted a bright future for the Ukrainian common people based on the democratic principle: "Ukraine was destroyed. But it only seems to be so ... the true Ukrainian -- whether of simple origin or noble -- must love neither a tsar nor a master but he must love and be mindful of one God, Jesus Christ, the king and master of heaven and earth. Thus it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be."[247]

In this way, while re-creating Ukrainian history to give people a sense of pride in their own history and a sense of continuity, Kostomarov gave people hope and a feeling that the current difficult situation of Ukrainians was only a transitional phase in their history. Since Kostomarov believed that Ukraine was a historical nation which inherited the national character of the Kyivan period (or/and even earlier historic period), he consistently claimed that "Ukraine will rise from her grave ... and will be an independent Republic in the Slavic Union."[248]

---

[245] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 84.

[246] Kostomarov, "Ob istoricheskom znachenii," p. 84.

[247] Kostomarov, "Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People," pp. 43-44.

After all, using folklore, Kostomarov established the elements of Ukrainian national identity and reconstructed the past of the Ukrainian people. Kostomarov's folklore studies focused not only on reconstructing the past, but also on reviving it and making it the new model for the development of the Ukrainian nation. Analyzing Ukrainian folklore and Slavic mythology, he found democratic and federalist national characteristics. Moreover, he organized the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius, the first Ukrainian ideological organization in modern times, and claimed that Ukraine would be a center of a democratic federation of Slavic nations.

---

[248] Kostomarov, "Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People," p. 45.

Chapter VI. Kostomarov's legacy

In the 1830s and 1840s, enthusiasm for the study of folklore, enhanced by the romantic nationalism of Herder, made its way to Ukraine and had a great influence on many intellectuals at Kharkiv University, including Mykola Kostomarov. While adopting the principles of romantic nationalism, which regarded folk poetry as the imprint of the soul of a nation and the native language as the most appropriate vehicle of the national spirit, Kostomarov was also influenced by the ideas and activities of his contemporary intellectuals. Under the influence of Kvitka's and Hohol's novels, Lunin's historical lectures, Maksymovych's collection of Ukrainian folksongs, Bodians'kyi's critical analysis on the difference between Russians and Ukrainians, Sreznevs'kyi's tales of old Zaporizhzhia, and other materials, Kostomarov began to realize the significance of folklore in the history of the common people and also developed his understanding of nationality.

In his second dissertation, Kostomarov clearly showed his perception of folklore. Connecting the problem of national character with folklore, Kostomarov regarded folksongs as the most useful source for learning about national character. In order to find the unique characteristics of the Ukrainian people, Kostomarov classified folksongs into three groups according to the type of human life: religious, historical, and social. Through this classification of folksongs, Kostomarov examined broad social classes and stratums of Ukrainian society using diachronic and synchronic frameworks. By examining Russian and Ukrainian folksongs in that way, Kostomarov clearly differentiated the "Little Russian" nationality from the "Great Russian."

Before and after 1846 when Kostomarov organized "the Brotherhood," his folklore study shifted from the cultural to the political stage. Kostomarov began to connect his folklore research with nationalistic endeavors. Based on the outcome of his earlier folklore study to identify national character, Kostomarov began to express his libertarian, Panslavic and religious ideals in *Knyhy bytiia ukrains'koho narodu* and declared political rights for Ukrainians based on the democratic-federalist principle. Moreover, in "Dve russkiia narodnosti," on the basis of folkloristic and historical evidence, Kostomarov insisted that differing geography and historical circumstances between Russia and Ukraine had resulted in different national characteristics for the two peoples.

Kostomarov's endeavors to find national character based on folk materials were made to perform his two main goals: the creation of a Ukrainian identity and the re-creation of Ukrainian history. At that time, in fact, Ukraine did not exist as a state and Ukrainians were not regarded as a separate nation. Moreover, many aspects of Ukrainian life were in danger of being absorbed into Russian culture. Therefore, intellectuals such as Kostomarov felt it was necessary to turn to folklore, which was regarded as the only source which reflected the lives of the Ukrainian common people, in an attempt to create a Ukrainian national identity as a shield against the absorption of Ukraine into Russia. The creating of a national identity was also connected with creating a "myth" of the history of a nation. While defining who Ukrainians are, Kostomarov had to explain the "origin" of Ukrainians and the historical continuity of their culture. In other words, he tried to establish how Ukrainians came into existence in the world and how they have lived from the pre-historic period to the present time. Showing the continuity of certain national characteristics and forms of social structure in all the periods of Ukrainian history based on folksongs, Kostomarov insisted that Ukrainians were a historical nation and a different nationality from Russians.

Kostomarov's contribution to Ukrainian folklore is discernible in many aspects. First, Kostomarov opened new fields of research for his contemporary folklorists and ethnographers. One of them was the study of symbolism. His work in this area was pioneering and had a great influence upon later folklorists, such as F. Buslaev, G. Afanas'iev, and especially O. Potebnia.[249] According to Hrushevs'kyi, Kostomarov's study of symbolism had a profound influence upon O. Potebnia and his dissertation "O nekotorykh simvolakh v slavianskoi narodnoi poesii"[250] (On some symbols in Slavic folk poetry), (1860), was clearly the continuation of Kostomarov's work.[251]

Second, Kostomarov regarded the study of folklore as a separate field of historical science and showed the possibility of joint research between folklore and other sciences. Especially emphasizing the relationship between folklore and history, Kostomarov insisted that the goal of folkloristics was a search of the past for models on which to shape the future. Also explaining the relationship between folklore and history, literature or language, he showed that folkloristics was not a supplementary but rather a complementary study, and that folklore was a science which covered all aspects of socio-historical life.

---

[249] See A. N. Pypin, *Istoriia russkoi etnografii* 3 (St. Petersburg: M. M. Stasiulevich, 1891), p. 168; and Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, "Etnohrafichne dilo Kostomarova," in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, p. xvi.

[250] A. A. Potebnia, "O nekotorykh simvolakh v slavianskoi narodnoi poezii" (Master's thesis, Kharkiv University, 1860).

[251] Hrushevs'kyi, "Etnografichne dilo Kostomarova," p. xvi.

Third, Kostomarov shifted the level of Ukrainian folklore study from the cultural to the political stage, or from collecting “old documents or rare folksongs” to seeking the pure national foundation on which to build the society of contemporary Ukraine. Selecting unique characteristics (such as closeness to nature, as well as religious, military, anarchical, democratic, federalist characteristics) of the Ukrainian people from folksongs, Kostomarov presented a model of future Ukrainian political life. Based on the results of this folklore study, Kostomarov predicted that Ukraine would be a center of a democratic federation of Slavic nations.

In spite of Kostomarov’s aforementioned contribution to Ukrainian folklore studies, it is also true that Kostomarov’s work had certain limitations. First, Kostomarov’s study on symbolism was considered to be undistinguished and superficial in comparision to the later work of Potebnia.[252] Second, Kostomarov’s comparison of Ukrainian folksongs with those of Russians was not really objective. The corpus of Ukrainian historical folksongs with which Kostomarov dealt in his study was larger and somewhat better explored than the Russian texts. Third, Kostomarov’s analogy between the character of a nation and that of an individual was somewhat simplistic.

Fourth, from the perspective of Ukrainian nationalism, his folklore study to find national character failed to develop the complete separatism of Ukraine from Russia. Kostomarov's pious attitude on Slavic antiquity and Slavic federalism seemed to preclude his developing the idea of complete independence. For this reason, even though Kostomarov found differences in the national character of the Ukrainians and the Russians, he did not insist on the complete political separation of Ukraine from Russia.

---

[252] Prymak, “Mykola Kostomarov and East Slavic Ethnography,” p. 185.

Fifth, Kostomarov's ethnographic determinism, which attributes all events and acts to national character, downplayed sociological and economical factors which contribute to the historical process. Later historians believed that Kostomarov's purpose as a historian was not entirely to explain, but to idealize. In this regard, Hrushevs'kyi depicted him not as a historian but as an icon painter.[253]

Concerning the idea of treating him as an icon painter, we need to examine the circumstances of the time, which led him to idealize the culture and history of Ukrainian common people. As I mentioned above, in the first half of the nineteenth century, Ukrainians were under the control of the Russian and the Habsburg Empires, and their identity was in danger of disappearing. Moreover, Russia had already claimed Kyivan Rus' as her own and had begun to implement a strong assimilation policy. In this situation, providing Ukrainians with a sense of collective existence and pride in their history was the only way to prevent the absorption of Ukrainian identity.

In this regard, Kostomarov tried to capture and enlighten his Ukrainian audience with his many writings. He painted a positive picture of Ukrainians on the basis of folk materials and encouraged them to take pride in their democratic-federative heritage, which lasted from Kyivan Rus' through the cossack period to the present time. In this way, Kostomarov succeeded in his role as a mythmaker. For Kostomarov, who stuck so strongly to folklore and mythology, what he was doing was revealing facts, not falsehoods.[254]

---

[253] See Prymak, *Mykola Kostomarov*, p. 194: Hrushevs'kyi said, "We do not find in him a clear construction of the social-historical process … We need historians, not icon painters."

It was true that there were several problems with Kostomarov's methodology in using folklore for his task. However, it was also true that only with his critical analysis and interpretation of Russian and Ukrainian folk materials, did Ukrainian national characteristics begin to be regarded differently from those of Russia and Ukrainians to be regarded as a historical nation, with a different nationality from that of Russians.

---

[254] See George H. Schoemaker, ed., *The Emergence of Folklore in Everyday Life* (Bloomington: Trickster Press, 1990), p. 237. According to Schoemaker, "The word myth is sometimes used by non-folklorists to mean something that is fallacious or silly, but folklorists do not use the word in this sense .... they (myths) explain why things are the way they are."

Bibliography

A. Collections of M. Kostomarov's works

Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova.
Ed. M. Hrushevs'kyi. Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1930.

Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova.
Ed. M. Hrushevs'kyi. Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1928.

Sobranie sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova: Istoricheskiia monografii i izsledovaniia. books 1-8, vols. 1-21. The Hague: European Printing, 1967.

Tvory. 2 vols. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1967.

B. Individual works by M. Kostomarov

"Avtobiografiia." *N. I. Kostomarov: Avtobiografiia i Bunt Sten'ki Razina.* Ed. Iu. A. Pinchuk. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1992, pp. 78-328. The earlier version of his "Avtobiografiia" was dictated to N. O. Bilozerska: "Avtobiografiia N. I. Kostomarova, zapisannaia N. A. Belozerskoi." *Russkaia mysl*, no. 5 (1885), pp. 185-223, no. 6 (1885), pp. 20-43.

"Book of genesis of the Ukrainian people." Trans. B. Yanivs'kyi. *Kostomarov's "Book of Genesis of the Ukrainian People" with a Commentary by B. Yanivs'kyi.* New York: Research program on the U.S.S.R., 1954, pp. 31-45. Kostomarov wrote the Ukrainian text of *Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People* in 1846. It was discovered and published in the short-lived journal *Nashe mynule*, no. 1 (1918), pp. 7-35.

"Cherty narodnoi iuzhno-russkoi istorii." *Osnova* (1861); reprinted in *Sobranie sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova*, book 1, vol. 1, 1967, pp. 67-158.

"Dve russkiia narodnosti." *Osnova*, no. 3 (1861), pp. 33-80; reprinted in *Sobranie sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova*, book 1, vol. 1, pp. 31-65. This was translated and reprinted; "Two Russian Nationalities." Trans. Thomas M. Prymak. *Towards an Intellectual History of Ukraine: An Anthology of Ukrainian Thought from 1710 to 1995.* Ed. Lindheim Ralph and George S. N. Luckyj. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1996, pp. 122-134.

"Istoricheskaia poeziia i novye ee materialy: "*Istoricheskiia pesni malorusskogo naroda*," s obiasneniiami V. Antonovicha i M. Dragomanova. Tom pervyi." *Vestnik Evropy*, no. 12 (1874), pp. 113-132; reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 299-334.

"Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhno-russkogo narodnogo pesennogo tvorchestva." in various numbers of *Beseda* (1872) and *Russkaia mysl'* (1880-1883); reprinted in *Sobranie sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova*, book 8, vol. 21, pp. 429-1081.

Kazka pro divku semylitku. St. Petersburg: Drukarnia P. A. Kulisha, 1860; reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 115-117.

"Malorusskaia literatura." *Poeziia Slavian.* Ed. N. V. Gerbel. St. Petersburg, 1871; reprinted in *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 240-247.

"Malorusskoe slovo." *Vestnik Evropy* 1, no. 1 (1881), pp. 401-407; reprinted in *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 267-270.

"Mysli o federativnom nachale v drevnei Rusi." *Osnova*, no. 1 (1861), pp. 121-158; reprinted in *Sobranie sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova*, book 1, vol. 1, pp. 1-30.

"Narodnye pesni, sobrannye v zapadnoi chasti Volynskoi Gubernii v 1844 godu." *Malorusskii literaturnyi sbornik.* Saratov, 1859, pp. 179-353; reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 127-202.

"Neskol'ko slov o slaviano-russkoi mifologii." *Russkiia Drevnosti.* Ed. V. Prokhorov. book 1 (1872), pp. 1-24; reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 283-298.

"O tsikle vesennikh pesen v narodnoi iuzhnorusskoi poezii." *Maiak*, book 21, vol. 11 (1843); reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 118-126.

"Ob istoricheskom znachenii russkoi narodnoi poezii." *Sochineniia Nikolaia Kostomarova*. Kharkiv: Universitetskaia tipografiia, 1843; reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 5-114.

"Ob otnoshenii russkoi istorii k geografii i etnografii." *Zapiski imperatorskogo russkogo geograficheskogo obshchestva* 12 (1863), pp. 92-113; reprinted in *Sobranie sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova*, book 1, vol. 3, pp. 717-731.

"Obzor sochinenii pisannykh na malorossiskom iazyke." *Molodik* 10 (1861), pp. 121-158; reprinted in *Tvory* 2, pp. 375-393.

"Sava Chalyi" was published under the pseudonym Iieremiia Halka. Halka, Iieremiia. *Sava Chalyi: Dramaticheskiia stseny na iuzhno-ruskom iazyky*. Kharkiv, 1838; reprinted in *Tvory* 1, pp. 145-202.

Slavianskaia mifologiia. Kyiv: Bainer, 1847; reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 203-240.

"Ukrains'kii balady" published under the pseudonym. Halka, Iieremiia. *Ukrains'kii balady*. Kharkiv, 1839; reprinted in *Tvory* 1, pp. 37-52.

"Vitka" published under the pseudonym. Halka, Iieremiia. *Vitka*. Kharkiv, 1840; reprinted in *Tvory* 1, pp. 53-83.

"Z privodu "*Malorusskikh narodnykh predanii i rasskazov*" M. Dragomanova." *Russkaia starina*, book 5 (1877), pp. 113-132; reprinted in *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 335-352.

"Z privodu '*Zapisok o iuzhnoi Rusi*' P. Kulisha." *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. 241-281. This work first appeared in *Otechestvennye zapiski* in various numbers for 1857.

C. Secondary sources

Antonovich, V. B. "N. I. Kostomarov kak istorik." *Kievskaia starina* 12, no. 5 (1885), pp. xxvi-xxxiv.

Bahalii, D. I. *Istoriia Slobids'koi Ukrainy.* Kharkiv: Osnova, 1990.

Barker, Ernest. *National Character and the Factors in Its Formation.* London: Methuen, 1948.

Berlin, Isaiah. *Vico and Herder.* London: Hogarth Press, 1976.

Besancon, Alain. "Nationalism and Bolshevism in the USSR." *The Last Empire: Nationality and the Soviet Future*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1986, pp. 1-13.

Čiževsky, Dmitry. "The Influence of the Philosophy of Schelling (1775-1854) in the Ukraine." *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts* 1855) *and Sciences in the U.S.* 5, no. 2-3 (winter-spring 1956), pp. 1128-1139.

Doroshenko, Dmytro. "A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography." *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Science in the U. S.* 5-6, no. 4 (1957), pp. 132-145.

Flynn, James T. "The Affair of Kostomarov's Dissertation: A Case Study of Official Nationalism in Practice." *Slavonic and East European Review*, no. 52 (1974), pp. 188-196.

Gogol, Nikolay. *Taras Bulba and Other Tales.* London and New York: Everyman's Library, 1966.

Gogol, Nikolay. *The Collected works of Nikolay Gogol: Evenings on a Farm Near Dikanka*. Trans. Constance Garnett. New York: Vail-Ballou Press, 1926.

Hagen, Mark von. "Does Ukraine Have a History?" *Slavic Review* 54, no 3 (Fall 1995), pp. 658-673.

Hrushevs'kyi, Mykhailo. "Etnohrafichne dilo Kostomarova." *Etnohrafichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. ix-xxiv.

------------------------------. "Ukrains'ka istoriografiia i Mykola Kostomarov." *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk,* book 5, vol. 50 (May, 1910), pp. 209-225.

------------------------------. "Z publitsystychnykh pysan' Kostomarova." *Naukovo-publitsystychni i polemichni pysannia Kostomarova*, pp. iii- xxi.

Ivancevich, Anthony Mario. "The Ukrainian National Movement and Russification." Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1976.

Iwanus, Jaroslaw. "Democracy, Federalism, and Nationality: Ukraine's Medieval Heritage in the Thought of N. I. Kostomarov." Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1986.

Kellas, James G. *The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.

Krawchenko, Bohdan. *Social Change and National Consciousness in Twentieth-Century Ukraine.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985.

Kyrylo-Mefodiivske Tovarystvo. 3 vols. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1990-1.

Luckyj, George S. N. *Between Gogol' and Ševčenko.* Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1971.

Magocsi, Paul Robert. *A History of Ukraine.* Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

Mann, Robert. *Lances Sing: A Study of the Igor Tale.* Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1989.

Miller, Frank J. *Folklore for Stalin.* New York and London: M. E. Sharpe, 1990.

Naumenko, V. "N. I. Kostomarov, kak etnograf." *Kievskaia starina*, no. 5 (1885), pp. xxxv-xliv.

Papazian, Dennis. "Nicholas Ivanovich Kostomarov: Russian Historian, Ukrainian Nationalist, Slavic Federalist." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966.

----------------------. "N. I. Kostomarov and the Cyril-Methodian Ideology." *Russian Review* 29, no. 1 (1970), pp. 59-73.

Popov, P. M. *M. Kostomarov iak fol'kloryst i etnohraf.* Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1968.

Pritsak, Omeljan. "Prolegomena to the National Awakening of the Ukrainians during the Nineteenth Century." *Culture and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Eastern Europe.* Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1985. pp. 96-110.

Prymak, Thomas M. *Mykola Kostomarov: A Biography*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

Prymak, Thomas M. "Mykola Kostomarov and East Slavic Ethnography in the Nineteenth Century." *Russian History* 18, no. 2 (Summer 1991), pp. 163-186.

Pynsent, Robert B. *Questions of Identity: Czech and Slovak Ideas of Nationality and Personality.* Budapest, London, and New York: Central European University Press, 1994.

Pypin, A. N. "N. I. Kostomarov." *Istoriia russkoi etnografii* 3. St. Petersburg: M. M. Stasiulevich, 1891, pp.151-187.

Seton-Watson, Hugh. “Russian Nationalism in Historical Perspective.” *The Last Empire,* pp. 14-29.

Schoemaker, George H. ed. *The Emergence of Folklore in Everyday Life.* Bloomington: Trickster Press, 1990.

Shabliovs’kyi, Ie. “Mykola Ivanovych Kostomarov, ioho zhyttia ta diial’nist’.” *Tvory* 1, pp. 5-33.

Silver, Brian D. “Ethnic Identity Change among Soviet Nationalities: A Statistical Analysis.” Ph. D. dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, 1972.

Subtelny, Orest. *Ukraine: A History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Ukrainian Dumy. Trans. George Tarnawsky and Patricia Kilina. Toronto and Cambridge: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies and Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1979.

Vil’chyns’kyi, Iurii. *Oleksandr Potebnia iak filosof.* L’viv: LDU, 1995.

Kubijovyč, Volodymyr. ed. *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia* 1. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963.

Voropai, Oleksa, *Zvychai nashoho narodu.* Kyiv: Oberih, 1993.

Wilson, William A. *Folklore and Nationalism in Modern Finland.* Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1976.

------------------------. “Herder, Folklore and Romantic Nationalism.” *Journal of Popular Culture*, no. 4 (1973), pp. 819-835.